SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q. WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco Unified Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

**EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY**

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr) ____________ Your Signature ____________

Print Your First Name ____________ MI ____________ Print Your Last Name ____________

Print the Address Where You Live ____________ Zip Code ____________

Day Phone ____________ Eve Phone ____________

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

Cantonese Mandarin Spanish Vietnamese Russian Other: [ ]

--- SPACE BELOW FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---

Assigned Precinct ____________ Home Precinct ____________

Affidavit Number ____________ Clerk ____________ Inspector ____________


Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102.
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# PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); 11-30
2. the location of your polling place; (see the label on the back cover) 11-30
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; back cover 11-30
4. Your rights as a voter; 8
5. information for disabled voters; 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; 32-33
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and 36
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting; inside back cover
28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

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

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

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

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

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

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

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

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

第一步
请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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

第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红色之上。

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

第三步
请把带防之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。
Respect for animals should be human nature. 

{ Don't you think? }

Find yourself a best friend.  
We're open 7 days a week,  
12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control  
City and County of San Francisco

Visit or call us today.  
1200 15th Street, S.F  
(415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork composed by MasterType Propress Services.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 401
NONPARTISAN
8th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-in Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word “YES” or “NO.”

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SEGUENTE
TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投兩無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國眾議員，州參議員，州眾議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投票無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國衆議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次選舉，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投票無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次選舉，無黨派選民不可以投票州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保障委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國衆議員，州參議員，州眾議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投票州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票
這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投票無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投票州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國衆議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投票州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投票無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以在州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國衆議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要在州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
## SAMPLE BALLOT

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

### NONPARTISAN BALLOT
BALOTA APARTIDARIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| State Superintendent of Public Instruction | DELAINE EASTIN  
Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asamblea | 135 |
| Educator / Educador | DAVID L. KILBER  
| Engineer / Ingeniero | 136 |
| Educador / 教育工作者 | CAROL S. KOPPEL  
Retired Judge / Juez jubilado | 137 |
| Educator / Educador | LEWIS S. KEIZER  
| Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación | 138 |
| Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones | FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE  
| Educador / 教育工作者 | 140 |
| Educador / 教育工作者 | JOSEPH D. CARRABINO  
| Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador | 142 |
| Teacher / Maestro / 教師 | WILBERT SMITH  
| High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria | 143 |
| Teacher / Maestro / 教師 | ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART  
| | 144 |
| Teacher/School Trustee / Maestro/Síndico escolar | GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN  
| | 145 |
| Educadores / 教育者 | MAUREEN G. DIMARCO  
| | 146 |
| Tax Collector |  
| |  
| Assessor | DORIS M. WARD  
| | 150 |
| Public Defender | JEFF BROWN  
Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco | 155 |
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California's economic vitality and to regain our state's high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state's economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1A
159 SI 贊成
ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO
Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Esta acta permite la
emision de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de
de2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de
retroajuste sismico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

160 NO 反对

1B
163 SI 贊成
ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permi-
ete una emision de bonos por un valor de mil millones de
de1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversion de
capital para la construccio en de las escuelas publicas y
la autorizacion de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses
que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de
Bonos para Ayuda de Edificacion de Escuelas de 1952 para
la construccion o mejora de escuelas publicas en la actualidad.

164 NO 反对

1C
169 SI 贊成
ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES
DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad
economica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas
de nuestro estado, esta acta autoriza la emision de bonos por
un valor de novecientos millones de dolares ($900,000,000)
para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y uni-
versidades publicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearan
trabajos y fortaleceran la economia del estado, proporcionando
oportunidades de capacitacion laboral para adultos y
estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y uni-
versidades publicas prevenan daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionaran alternativas al crimen y a las pandilllas al asegurar el acceso a
e una educacion superior. Mejoraran la calidad del aprendizaje en
ciudades universitarias publicas, mejorando las aulas y
proporcionando modernos tecnologias de enseñanza. Los pro-
yectos autorizados para 136 ciudades universitarias publicas
incluyen, pero no estan necesariamente limitados a, mejores en
caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad,
actualizaciop del laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los
adelantos cientificos, mejorar y modernizar de los
centros de computacion de las ciudades universitarias y
construccion de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastara ninguna
parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos
administrativos generales.

170 NO 反对
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

8E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL
AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an in-
come tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal
Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in
the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’
credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITU-
TIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from
locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross
receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the
near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGIS-
LATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt
from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of
all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact:
Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in
the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred
by school districts (about half the total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS ESTATUTARIOS

185 SI 赞成
186 NO 反对

征税：对租赁用住宅的房地产税。提供有资格的低收入者的税收减免。在租
房者所得税扣除。立法权法案
该提案，修改宪法，提供有资格的租
房者所得税减免。在个人不
少于60元，其他人则不少于
120元，财政影响：在1995-96年
度，州开支将会增加1亿元，将来会
有未知的，但可能的开支增加，因
为州政府将不能削减租房者的
所得税扣除。

191 SI 赞成
192 NO 反对

2015年6月7日，关岛

198 SI 赞成
199 NO 反对

征税：对租赁用住宅的房地产税。提供有资格的低收入者的税收减免。在租
房者所得税扣除。立法权法案
该提案，修改宪法，提供有资格的租
房者所得税减免。在个人不
少于60元，其他人则不少于
120元，财政影响：在1995-96年
度，州开支将会增加1亿元，将来会
有未知的，但可能的开支增加，因
为州政府将不能削减租房者的
所得税扣除。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAMPLE BALLOT
**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**  
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>211</th>
<th>212</th>
<th>213</th>
<th>214</th>
<th>215</th>
<th>216</th>
<th>217</th>
<th>218</th>
<th>219</th>
<th>220</th>
<th>221</th>
<th>222</th>
<th>223</th>
<th>224</th>
<th>225</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROPOSICIONES</strong></th>
<th><strong>Descripción</strong></th>
<th><strong>Razones</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD, EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA.</td>
<td>ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir el impuesto sobre la propiedad de los equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazará las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA.</td>
<td>Especifica una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligir daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA.</td>
<td>Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.</td>
<td>YES 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?</td>
<td>YES 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?</td>
<td>YES 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?</td>
<td>YES 256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反对

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyan modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反对

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

251 SI 贊成
252 NO 反对

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

256 SI 贊成
257 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?

F10

F0N

25
E  Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

YES 263  NO 264

F  Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES 270  NO 271

G  Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES 274  NO 275

H  Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES 278  NO 279

I  Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES 283  NO 284
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263 SI 贊成
¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los Impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

264 NO 反对

270 SI 贊成
¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

271 NO 反对

274 SI 贊成
¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de llamas sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

275 NO 反对

278 SI 贊成
¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los Impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

279 NO 反对

283 SI 贊成
¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?

284 NO 反对
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J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?
YES 289
NO 290

K
Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?
YES 295
NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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289 SI 贊成
¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se quedan dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona está usando dicha máquina?

290 NO 反對

295 SI 贊成
¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

296 NO 反對
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INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un candidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "Si" o "No."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知：

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你摳過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.
The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.
The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor

My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorestein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Berman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Wille B. Kennedy, 50 Chumashero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Levin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Conn, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dui, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardenside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodol E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.
BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

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

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

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

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

“Opponent’s Argument”

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

Rebuttal Arguments

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

Paid Arguments

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

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

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

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

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or re-construction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

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

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: 56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
School Bonds

PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:
- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings....”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”. Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

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

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Roofop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate.

While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.

It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

Taxpayers deserve more accountability!
PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It's not the doors that need rehabilitating!
San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children's Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O'Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as "temporary" and further alleges that their condition is "critical". THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’ Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor's Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’ Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Narlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTENO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

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

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECOGNIZING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

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

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

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

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

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition: "SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary and convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absence ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein.

Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

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

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPayers MONEY"!!!
Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Irene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents' arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course: paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.
Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.
Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?  

YES  NO  →

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

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

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER??

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WASTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

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

VOTE “NO” ON “FUNNY-MONEY” PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called “Equipment Lease-Financing” and other “funny-money” credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to “anticipate” local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of “credit card government” with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970’s was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit “games” to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more “funny-money” credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote “NO” on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote “NO” on Proposition C.

Also vote “NO” on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committee member

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE qualified ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20,000,000, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City’s budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

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

Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Bierman and Hallinan.
Police Staffing

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes
San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.
Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city's violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.
We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.
Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.
Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.
Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.
Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.
None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!
Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.
Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.
This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BE FOOLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!
If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.
Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.
As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

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

OPOPOSITION TO PROPOSITION D
In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bieman

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.
Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.
Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.
I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.
Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.
Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.
Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member

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

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the “FULL FORCE FUNDING” initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support “FULL FORCE FUNDING” for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

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

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konapka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Ammendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Ammendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.

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

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary. The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld
Robert Boomer
Donald A. Casper
Rose Chung
James E. Gilleran
Sam T. Harper
Harold Hoogasian
Joanne "Jody" Stevens
Charles J. Wong

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it's full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994 - 1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narc busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
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Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL.
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:
We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county to be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:
San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND
(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.
(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users’ preferences to the facility’s operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.
Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.
(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.
(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.
(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
Library Fund

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

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

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
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Library Fund

PROPOHENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPOHENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government.

It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries' budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.

In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city's bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city's health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department's budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you're going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You've got a thing or two to learn about "good government".

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It's not enough to promise you'll keep them open when you're unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you've been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That's why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won't work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won't fall if Proposition E passes. It's unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco's Public Libraries

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

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children—a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Selene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: it guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed "reading centers" but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Miller, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Robertia Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kall
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade.
Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.
Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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Library Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco's branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

 Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn't necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries - without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We're promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can't they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children's Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of "Reading Centers", and Books, Books, Books: that's what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that's what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth. Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of "direct democracy." Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E.

Lawrence Wong  
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we're to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco's public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos  
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City's budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment; because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City's future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city's economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate  
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro  
Leonela Ramirez, Don Ramnom  
Theodore Seiun
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
   Jeanna Haney
   Marie Plazewski
   Rev. Arnold Townsend
   Peter Gabel
   Vivian Wiley
   Alexa Smith
   Karen Fitzgerald
   Patrick Fitzgerald
   Eddie Chin
   Lulu Carter
   Leslie Katz
   Matthew Rothschild
   Natalie Berg
   Caitlin Curtin
   Claire Zvanski
   Maria Martinez
   Mike Bosia
   Mary Johnson
   Elaine Collins-McBride
   Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurur
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Levo
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. **For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.**

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlotta del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

---

**Good Government Provides Good Libraries!**

**Good government** ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! **Good government** means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. **Good government** works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

**Good government** does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits!

**Good government** does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

**Good Government** preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, **good government** is impossible without good libraries. **We support good government. We support Proposition E!**

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

---

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

**San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process.** That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

**Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.**

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

**Supervisor Angela Alioto**
**Supervisor Kevin Shelley**
**Supervisor Susan Leal**
**Supervisor Bill Maher**
**BART Director Michael Bernick**
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Eola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaan Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacker
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue
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Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn't have as many books, and librarians were banished.

"We want to go to the library!" the children cried. "Not today," replied the unhappy parents. "The library isn't open in the afternoon anymore."

The people protested, "This isn't fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn." The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

"No way," the king proclaimed. "I'll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I'll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I'll stop planting flowers in the park."

This made the children very sad. "Why is the king so mean?" they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
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Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp
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Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

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

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, I believe that there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
PROпонент's ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REБУТТАL TO PROПОНент'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ario Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!

Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised!

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!

Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!

Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.
Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.
Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.
Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.
Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.
The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

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

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 1, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION F (Continued)

made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony, as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony, as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to mental exertion in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to mental exertion in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolition.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolition.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

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

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;

(b) Statements of the expenditures by item for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year; in any item of the proposed estimate;

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;

(e) Such other information as the Mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 - 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 - 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

(a) the overall mission and goals of the department

(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals

(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department

(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities

(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity

(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

(b) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall henceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller's issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

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

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City's current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public's needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to "reinvent" government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boothe Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee of California Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committeeman and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrea de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

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

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” IS FOR “GOUGING”!

Proposition “G” is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.

What a joke!

The change from a “line item” to “mission driven” budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate “missions” and “goals” should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on “research” and “studies” to “implement” a “mission statement.” With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on “mission driven” budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”.
Vote “NO” on “G”!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

**BREAK IT DOWN**: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP**: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT**: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT**: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME**: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN**: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:

*Peter Donohue, Ph.D.*, consulting economist

*Marc Norton*, community activist

*Joel Ventresca*, budget and policy analyst

*Calvin Welch*, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden

Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

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

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn't be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn't be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn't deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

• Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.

• Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.

• Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let's make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!

VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition I's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardian directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ALONG HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
Airport BART Station

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.

But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We've paid our fair share!

Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city's general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We're sick of politicians saying, "Trust me!" With Proposition H we don't have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That's a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don't need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodol Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:
- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 - 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?.

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 - $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 - $400 million ($300 - $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service. Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!

San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!

A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!

If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. VOTE NO on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully, Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Baccalupi, CPA
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 Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

 VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

 Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep's clothing: it's not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

 PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

 Frank Cvetovac
 Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

 Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.

 It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

 Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

 There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

 Don't get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

 Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
 Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

 The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half-baked.

 Vote No on Prop H.

 Joe O'Donoghue
 Residential Builders Association

 I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

 As the world's "Number One Tourist Destination," and one of the world's leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

 Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

 Vote YES on Proposition I.

 Jon Kouba
 San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

 Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn't provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

 WHAT A WASTE! LET'S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

 For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They've spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn't address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

 VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

 Alex Corns
 Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
 Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. It’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nellie R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka
   Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawetz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weaverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuella N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

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

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.

☐
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

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

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES

NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “I” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.

THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

* The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
* All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
* San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airport passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/ BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/ SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part: "WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage. WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million. WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985..."

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. Don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

VOTE YES ON Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felts, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noo Valley Democratic Club
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It's vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport's $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART's own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let's be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn't been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don't let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let's move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural "trace" already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it's time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won't improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!

Whether you're a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate
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It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core. US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation as a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Healh's Prop. I approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
- Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
- Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!
Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!
Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.
Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.
Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.
Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.
And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.
Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Ahbolin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchais, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.
I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grandchild, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years.
BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport.
Any other alignment would be transit craziness.
• The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
• The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
• Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Berneck, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue. VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don’t fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restauranteur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future's course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The "almost at the Airport" BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let's choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don't have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn't!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote "YES" on "I"!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!
WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.
Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport's light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport's 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:
YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco's Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition "I" would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airine terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
• The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport? If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:

It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 - $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 - $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!
- If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanne Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rotfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 - $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.

2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.

3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme. The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly
Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How “J” Got on the Ballot

On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City's multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won't make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn't prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can't do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won't have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM's really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM's? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a "safety" zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM's. The Mayor's law seeks to play on the public's emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM's. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let's not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let's ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM's while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM's.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM's is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.
You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlers must take place before we take action to protect people?
Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.
Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can't help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn't be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association
Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply
Geroge Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.
Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors
Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors
Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition says we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined—or even jailed—for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.

Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.

You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.
The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
  • chat with a friend,
  • distribute flyers,
  • sip coffee,
  • hail a cab,
  • gather petition signatures, or
  • read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(PROHIBITING LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121

TheroTO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

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

Section I. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public's safety and welfare.

Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine.

Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

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

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

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance. In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

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

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot
On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROPOSEN'TS ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units. In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSEN'TS ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON'T HAVE TO "APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING—WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS."

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer's check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let's not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

*Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check.* Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

*Vote NO on Proposition K.*

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

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

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Briggs
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice L. Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca  
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY  
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled. 

☐
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:

To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

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

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

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

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

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side? Your return address:

__________________________

__________________________

Germaine Q. Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall - Room 158
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco CA 94102 4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco,
California
Permit No. 2750

CAR-RT SORT

Ballot Type
Nonpartisan
Precincts Applicable
401
8th Congressional District
2001 through 2216
8th State Senate District
2701 through 2714
12th Assembly District
2901 through 2919

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.
If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number

City State Zip Code

Check below, if it is true for you:
☐ I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.
☐ My NEW address is printed below.
☒ Residence address ONLY.

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
941

Zip Code

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an
absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained
on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version.
☐ I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in:
Spanish________ Chinese________

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

The Date You Signed

To contact you if there is a problem with your application:
Your Day Time Phone Number
Your Evening Phone Number
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q. WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge everyone who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

**EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY**

**REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION**

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

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

Sign Here

Print Your First Name ___________________________ MI _______________ Print Your Last Name ___________________________

Print the Address Where You Live ___________________________ ___________________________ Zip Code ___________________________ ___________________________

Day Phone ___________ - ___________ Eve. Phone ___________ - ___________

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

I HAVE a car: ___________ (Please Check)

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

--- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---

Assigned Precinct: ___________________________ Home Precinct: ___________________________

Affidavit Number: ___________________________ Clerk: ___________________________ Inspector: ___________________________

E.O. Bk. ___________ 6/2 ___________ 6/6 ___________ Code ___________ Reg. Attached ___________ Init'l. ___________

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .................. 11-30
2. the location of your polling place; ................................................................. 11-30
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ................. back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ................................................................. 11-30
5. information for disabled voters; ................................................................. 11-30
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ................................................................. 11-30
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ................................................................. 11-30
8. definitions of words you need to know; and ................................................................. 11-30
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. ................................................................. 11-30
Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

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

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

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
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The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.
Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.
 If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

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

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

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

Notes: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

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

第一步
请双手持票向自动机槽整张选票插入。

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

第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

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

第三步
请把带锁之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

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

第四步
投票之后，把选票取出，
沿虚线提起选票交给选站监选员。
RESPECT for ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE

{DON'T YOU THINK?}
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 402
NONPARTISAN
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE
請轉下頁開始投票

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國衆議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，
包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨
派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美
國參議員，美國眾議員，州參議員，州眾議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國眾議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
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CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Controlor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EEUU, Representante de los EEUU, Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國眾議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apártidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apártidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apártidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apártidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，包括州教育部長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國眾議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Supervisor de la Escuela Estatal</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAINE EASTIN</td>
<td>Teacher Assembly Woman</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS S. KEIZER</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRY L. MARTIN</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE</td>
<td>Research Engineer</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILBERT SMITH</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAL RICE</td>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN</td>
<td>English Language Teacher</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN G. DIMARCO</td>
<td>Education Cabinet Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY AND COUNTY</th>
<th>無黨派出票</th>
<th>公共辯護律師</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doris M. Ward</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC DEFENDER</th>
<th>Defensor Público</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

   YES 159  ➔
   NO 160  ➔

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

   YES 163  ➔
   NO 164  ➔

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state's high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

   YES 169  ➔
   NO 170  ➔
ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza la emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las universidades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras medidas de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las universidades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 - 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters' credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons' access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贏成
186 NO 反对

CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUI- NOS. ENMIENNA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás.
Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $10 millones en 1995 – 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

187 SI 贏成
188 NO 反对

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENNA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Exima a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

191 SI 贏成
192 NO 反对

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENNA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente el 40% del total).

175

176

177
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPUSIONES ESTATALES

211 SI 贊成
EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según lo define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

212 NO 反對

218 SI 贊成
ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de injuriar daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

219 NO 反對

224 SI 贊成
LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTORICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza la emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

225 NO 反對

178

179

180
A
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

B
Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

C
Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?
### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>F10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994</td>
<td>舊金山市、縣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
<td>提交選民投票表決的市、縣提案</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PREGUNTA</th>
<th>OPCIÓN A</th>
<th>OPCIÓN B</th>
<th>OPCIÓN C</th>
<th>OPCIÓN D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237 SI</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejores, mejoras para acatar la Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 SI</td>
<td>¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 SI</td>
<td>¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 SI</td>
<td>¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

FaN 25
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

E  Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

YES 263
NO 264

F  Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES 270
NO 271

G  Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES 274
NO 275

H  Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES 278
NO 279

I  Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES 283
NO 284
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que se realizará sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反对

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反对

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

   YES 289 ➔
   NO 290 ➔

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

   YES 295 ➔
   NO 296 ➔

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

289 SI 贊成
Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se quedan dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

290 NO 反對

295 SI 贊成
Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyan personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

296 NO 反對

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SÓLOMENÊ DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACIÓN QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACIÓN; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LÁPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dandidado no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "Sí" o "No."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知:

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選舉上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你摺起、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，請把選票退回給選舉站的監票員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

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

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.
As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.
We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.
My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shoresthe, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliirtus St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Wille B. Kennedy, 50 Chumaserio Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 39 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender’s office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Furrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loreta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardsends Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Melkins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Milgden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO'S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond "debt service" during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. ("Debt Service" is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a "Yes" vote means, and what a "No" vote means. There is a statement by the City's Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

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

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

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

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

"Proponent's Argument"

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

"Opponent's Argument"

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

Rebuttal Arguments

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

Paid Arguments

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

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

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

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

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City's budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party's candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
School Bonds

PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

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

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

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

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
School Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.
Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- “Contracting out” routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

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

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it's the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can't keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather "stick it" to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say "No" to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don't believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling "temporary" bungalows at the Richmond District's Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district's John O'Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Roofstop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be "stuck" with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a school for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

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

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn't it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren't running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that's the fallacy of Proposition A.

It's no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco's schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of $99 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco's public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn't working, it won't get you anywhere.

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don't have to pay? Everyone's quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn't do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That's why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we've shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn't it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn't their priorities be increasing student's test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!**

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

**Taxpayers deserve more accountability! PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!**

San Francisco Taxpayers Association  
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, **Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!**

Tim Carrico  
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical.” **THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!**

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. **Vote NO on Measure A.**

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent  
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force  
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent  
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident  
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

**Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.**

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner  
Commissioner  
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

**David Gruber**
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF $95,000,000 OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IF AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000, for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

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

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

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

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

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be held and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

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

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on "B"

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

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.6 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street),

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

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

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should **BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.**

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up **MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.**

Many of the **BUREAUCRATS** running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: **DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT??**

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases

Ario Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeeman

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee

John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents' arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco's 911 problems can't be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.
Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.
Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City's Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES ➞ NO ➞

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

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

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

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

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER?!!

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WASTING PROPOSITION C!!!
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Chairman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committee Chairman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DEscribing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the city and county of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof relating to the financing of the acquisition of equipment.

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

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
**Police Staffing**

**PROPOSITION D**

Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City’s budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

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

**Controller’s Statement on “D”**

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

**How Supervisors Voted on “D”**

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.

San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes. Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FooLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

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

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.

This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!

Our officers deserve it!!

The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden

Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.

The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat

Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno

Founder — Justice for Murder Victims

Cristine Mack

Member

Helga D’Arcy

Member

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

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the “FULL FORCE FUNDING” initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support “FULL FORCE FUNDING” for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Nortlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD ( Residents Against Drugs) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.
Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Irene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Ammendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Ammendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That’s why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period. That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary. The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to its full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

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

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full-duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges VOTE NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget bust. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irrevocable, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

VOTE NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
- clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
- police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
- police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
- narcotics busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
- jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
- cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
- vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
- police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
- police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark V. Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:
We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part I of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:
San Francisco Charter Section 6.416 LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND
(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.
(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January, 1, 1995, the library mission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986-1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.
Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection. Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.
(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.
(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.
(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992–93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

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

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

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How "E" Got on the Ballot
On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot. 42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiatives petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government's priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
- a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
- a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
- money for a respectable book budget;
- a library for the blind;
- the main library;
- much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco's Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government.

It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.

In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police offers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs. When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children — a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sebene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Oreilia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Boveland, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Potola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steinman, Susan Tauer, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Strong
Virginia Gee
Ken Rominas

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Call, Retired Librarian

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours. These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Cothirst

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorrwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monei, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city's annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what's important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City's last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we're to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco's unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lois Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
Lee Ann Hamma Prifti, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passan
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacker
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O'Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City's 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children's education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to retain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can't afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

---

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straightjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

---

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES ▶ NO ▶

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
Employment after Retirement

PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City's $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition F

San Francisco Already Has Part-Time Temporary Civil Service Employees — Proposition F Will Save the City Nothing.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City's high unemployment rate, why doesn't San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against 'Freeloading'
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Committeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
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Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"

Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised!

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!
Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading"
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

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

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION F (Continued)

made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member’s individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member’s individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

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

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any item(s) of the proposed estimate;

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

a) the overall mission and goals of the department
b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities

e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity

f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsection a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

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

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITOR'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services.

The City's current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public's needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to "reinvent" government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITOR'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a "Mission Driven Budget" is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — "Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations").

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service "deadwood", seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special "WARNING TO VOTERS" page in the front of this "Voters Handbook".

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — "rule-driven" San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmuitz, or their "Boodle Board" of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE "NO" ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee of California Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

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

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"
 Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control. What a joke!

The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”. Vote “NO” on “G”!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith  
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner  
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith  
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa  
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods  
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

The City's budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need "Neighborhood-Based Budgeting":

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn't.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!
Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H
Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

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

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot
On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!
Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

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

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

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

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSED ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

 Supervisor Carole Migden
 Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
 Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Doris Ward, Assessor

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.

But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We've paid our fair share!

Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city's general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We're sick of politicians saying, "Trust me!" With Proposition H we don't have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That's a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don't need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos

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

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:
- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10-16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?
- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

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

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area's economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST

STATION IS ONE THAT'S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don't want a station that's going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let's help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
   Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers

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

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco's transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city's history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user's nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city's General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don't allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh's third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh's solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh's early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU'RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn't deserve your support and shouldn't even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn't have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp's BART into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It's motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco's greatest step for public transportation in the city's history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!
If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bactigalupi, CPA
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.

It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half-baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36

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

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's
the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving
Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast,
convenient BART service into SFO.
PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a
mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San
Francisco and the Bay Area. It's plan brings BART directly under
the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the
largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes
an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop.
I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50
feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!
We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO —
VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN
INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!
Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport,
forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of
public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.
Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the
Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals
— just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO's
brand new International Terminal.
No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage
check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.
AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND
CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST
ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. "YES" ON I AND
"NO" on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco

Thomas F. Hayes
Former BART Director
Patrick J. Dowling
Anne Quilter
Charles J. Sullivan
Mary C. Sullivan
Joan Finucane
Dan Dunnigan
Margaret Mylett
William Fitzgerald
Julia Fitzgerald
Thomas McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Patricia Hayes
Mary O’Donnell
V.P. John Maher Irish-American Political Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Position I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka
Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drejke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawetz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weaverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore
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AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

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

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission’s determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE
EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT
SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

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

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 15135(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

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

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facilitycharge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “I” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

Arguments for and Against this Measure immediately follow this page.

The full text of Proposition I is on page 98.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.

THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail. Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition “I” station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 – $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition “I” requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition “I” station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition “I” because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote NO on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevrey
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Graceman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part"

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposed Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what's right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let's do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City's general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I's opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
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As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strusnky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport. We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conway
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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It’s sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don’t want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world, can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It’s just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco’s reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!
VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih’s Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right.

VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let’s Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O’Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning. It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREeway from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
- Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
- Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don’t be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes! Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn’t in the airport and doesn’t meet the needs of today’s business travelers? Let’s do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!
Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!
Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.
Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.
Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.
Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.
And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.
Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegner, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Ahbolin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchali, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.
I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be borne by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco  
Ernesto A. Pasco  
Josie P. Corpus  
Laurel E. Ayag  
Noemi N. Sablad

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly to San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Berndt, San Francisco BART Director  
James Pang, San Francisco BART Director  
Wilfred Usery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don’t fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider

Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider

Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist

Richmond Young
HIV Task Force

Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist

Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation

Les Pappas
AIDS Educator

Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restaurant/Owner
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile a way from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!

VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police

Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims

Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, S.F Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed "environmentalist" cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat's meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT'S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and haste than Proposition I.
• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “T” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10—16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
• The $100—$400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.

• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100—$400 million ($300—$1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.
Vote NO on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

National Women’s Political Caucus
*Donna Provenzano*, President
*Anna Shimko*, Political Action Chair

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

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- **If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

- **If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!

- **If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club  
Matthew Rothschild, Chair  
Democratic County Central Committee  
Carole Migden, Chair  
Lulu Carter  
Eddie Chin  
Caitlin Curtin  
Jeanna Haney  
Leslie Katz  
Marisa Martinez  
Elaine Collins McBride  
Claire Zwanski  
Jim Rivaldo  
Norman Rolfe  

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner  
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member  
Max Woods  
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly
Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  

YES  \[\rightarrow\]  
NO  \[\rightarrow\]

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot

On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.
This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multimillion dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM's while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.
Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM's.
Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.
San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.
Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM's is not a good use of scarce Police resources.
Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.
You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?
Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.
Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can't help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.
Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn't be in the zone, will be made to move.
I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
  President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association
Clifford Waldeck
  President, Waldeck’s Office Supply
Geroge Michael Patterson
  Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.
Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on "J"

Glenda C. Powell
  President, Inner Mission Neighbors
Connie Ramirez Webber
  Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors
Alex Romo
  Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
  Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy. THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say’s we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?
We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
  Save Our Streets
  Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.
Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.
You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far. Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)
AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

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

Section I. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public's safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be made by the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

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

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

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON'T HAVE TO "APPROVE THE IDEA OF
CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE
SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS."

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer's check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let's not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright

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

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing project on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bausener
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

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

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazaneve
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsumi Diggigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

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

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be. Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
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AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Owl

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.
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1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
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Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

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

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.
Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.
Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Dept. of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, **take this page with you to the polls.** Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your **Polling Place** is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

---

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

Your return address:

---

Germaine Q Wong  
San Francisco Registrar of Voters  
City Hall -- Room 158  
400 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you. The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

---

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION** - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election **SIGN** this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

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

**P.O. Box or Street Number:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.O. Box or Street Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Check below, if it is true for you:**
- [ ] I have moved since the last time I registered to vote. My **NEW** address is printed below. (Residence address ONLY.)

**Number and Street Name, Apartment Number:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Street Name, Apartment Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO, CA</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.**
- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version. I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: **Spanish**, **Chinese**.

**You MUST SIGN** here to receive a ballot.

**Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT**

**To contact you if there is a problem with your application:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Date You Signed</th>
<th>Your Day Time Phone Number</th>
<th>Your Evening Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER
HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge everyone who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)  
Signature

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

Print the Address Where You Live

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

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

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

------------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS -------------------------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number: Clerk: Inspector:


Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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**PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET**

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ............................................. 11-30
2. the **location of your polling place**; .......................................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an **application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status**; .................................................. back cover
4. **Your rights as a voter**; ........................................................................... 8
5. **information for disabled voters**; ............................................................ 5
6. **statements from candidates** who are running for local office; .......... 32-33
7. **information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ......................................................... 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and ............................................. 36
9. a **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting. .................. inside back cover
28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."

2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.

3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.

4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.

5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.

6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

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

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

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting  
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
  National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
  League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
  The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
  San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
  National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
  Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
  Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
  Registrar of Voters

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

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

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

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

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

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:

• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR

• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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

第二步
請切割將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

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

第三步
請把帶錘之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉委員會員。
Respect for animals should be human nature. {Don't you think?}

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today. 1200 15th Street, S.F. (415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork, composed by Masterypes Prepress Services.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 403
NONPARTISAN
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-in Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。
NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱之為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國衆議員，州參議員，州眾議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不能投票州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國眾議員，州參議員，州眾議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平華局委員，美國參議員，美國眾議員，州參議員，州眾議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投票無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投票州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國衆議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投票州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

In this PRIMARY ELECTION, a voter who is not registered as a member of a political party, called a nonpartisan or independent voter, may vote for the nonpartisan offices, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and San Francisco Assessor and Public Defender, and for all ballot measures. For the Primary Election, a nonpartisan voter does not vote for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, US Senator, US Representative, State Senator, State Assembly, or Party County Committee.

At the General Election on November 8, a nonpartisan voter will vote for candidates for State offices and for State and Federal legislative seats.

The nonpartisan portion of this Sample Ballot booklet begins on Page 17.

BALOTA APARTIDARIA

En estas ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS, un elector que no esté registrado como miembro de un partido político, denominado elector apartidario o independiente, podrá votar por los puestos apartidarios: el Superintendent de la Instrucción Pública y el Asesor Público y Procurador Público de San Francisco, además de todas las medidas de la balota. En el caso de las elecciones primarias, un elector apartidario no vota por Gobernador, Vicegobernador, Secretario de Estado, Contralor, Tesorero, Fiscal General, Comisionado de Seguros, Consejo de Compensación, Senador de los EE.UU., Representante de los EE.UU., Asamblea Estatal o Comité del Condado del Partido.

En las Elecciones Generales del 8 de noviembre, un elector apartidario podrá votar por candidatos para los puestos del Estado y para los asientos legislativos estatales y federales.

無黨派選票

這次預選，沒有登記為任何政黨黨員的選民，稱為無黨派或獨立選民，可以投選無黨派公職，包括州教育廳長，舊金山估稅官和公共辯護律師，以及所有列於選票上的提案。在今次預選，無黨派選民不可以投選州長，副州長，州務卿，主計官，司庫，州檢察長，保險委員，平準局委員，美國參議員，美國衆議員，州參議員，州衆議員，或政黨縣委員會。

在11月8日舉行的普選，無黨派選民將要投選州公職候選人，州和聯邦立法議席候選人。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>David L. Kilber</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol S. Koppel</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis S. Keizer</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perry L. Martin</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Joseph Anthony Mele</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph D. Carrabin</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilbert Smith</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert 'Rob' Stewart</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hal Rice</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gloria Matta Tuchman</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maureen G. Dimarco</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delaine Eastin</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Doris M. Ward</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

---

**NONPARTISAN BALLOT**

**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

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

---

**1A**

**EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994.** This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

**YES 159**

**NO 160**

---

**1B**

**SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994.** This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

**YES 163**

**NO 164**

---

**1C**

**HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994.** To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

**YES 169**

**NO 170**
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS ESTATUALES

1A
159 SI 賛成
160 NO 反對

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SÍSMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMotos. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B
163 SI 賛成
164 NO 反對

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de ellos en consecuencia con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C
169 SI 賛成
170 NO 反對

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vida económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza la emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

FaN
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER’S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
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↑ 185 SI 贊成
↓ 186 NO 反对

CRECITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos del Estado de $100 millones en 1995 - 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

↑ 191 SI 贊成
↓ 192 NO 反对

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

↑ 198 SI 贊成
↓ 199 NO 反对

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

↑ 175

无黨派選票
F8

↑ 176

稅：非牟利團體，立法補充法案
Exempts non-profit organizations from the property tax; if the property is used for educational or charitable purposes.

↑ 177

物業稅改革，保障人性通路，立法補充法案
Amends property tax law to reduce the tax burden on homeowners, particularly those who are elderly or disabled.

FaN
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

向左箭头

211 SI 贊成
EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fincas agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurredas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

向左箭头

212 NO 反对

218 SI 贊成
ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligir daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

向左箭头

219 NO 反对

224 SI 贊成
LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

向左箭头

225 NO 反对

178 無黨派選票

179 無黨派選票

180 無黨派選票
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CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

10E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes. YES 237  NO 238

B Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services? YES 244  NO 245

C Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year? YES 251  NO 252

D Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol? YES 256  NO 257
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $85,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condados de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Mil Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

251 SI 贊成
252 NO 反對

¿Desea que se regule que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?

256 SI 贊成
257 NO 反對

F10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
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263 SI 贊成
Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

264 NO 反对

270 SI 贊成
Desea que se permita que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades y conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

271 NO 反对

274 SI 贊成
Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

275 NO 反对

278 SI 贊成
Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

279 NO 反对

283 SI 贊成
Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?

284 NO 反对

E

F

G

H

I

J
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J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  
YES 289  
NO 290

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?  
YES 295  
NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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289 SI 贊成
¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático (“ATM”) durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

290 NO 反對

有人在使用自动提款机（ATM）提款時，如果有人在30尺内闲游散漫超过一分钟，应否予以禁止?

295 SI 贊成
¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

296 NO 反對

應否授權獲批對公共機構資助的公私富豪在舊金山市、縣發展、建築或購置廉租樓宇，為低收入的個人和家庭，包括老年人或殘障人士提供數逾3,000個廉租住宅單位？

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACIÓN QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACIÓN; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un candidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha en frente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知:

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你摺過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING, TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.
The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES
On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.
The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor

My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.

Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hillitas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.

Sue Berman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumash Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Courtoy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Nancy Lavin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender’s office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Doh, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardeside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.
BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

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

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

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

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

“Opponent’s Argument”

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

Rebuttal Arguments

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

Paid Arguments

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

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

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

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

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts, and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or lands, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land, or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or re-construction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

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

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

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

- Bond redemption $95,000,000
- Bond interest 56,356,250
- Debt service requirement $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

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

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

• A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
• The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
• Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School
• An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
• New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

• Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
• Installing exterior security lighting systems.
• Providing full handicap access as required by law.
• Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
• Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
• Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”. Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:
• Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
• “Contracting out” routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.

• Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
• Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

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

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
School Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting YES on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings.

By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate.

While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote YES on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

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

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be met if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

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

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Francisco community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn't it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Eateneuer

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

San Francisco Association of Realtors
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! Taxpayers deserve more accountability!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating!
San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”. This IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

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

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco's prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can't make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECALLING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION,

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

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

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

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

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

 Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

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

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
The full text of Proposition B is on page 46.
PROPOsEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.
Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOsEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

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

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Irene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.
Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.
Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

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

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

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

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C
Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!
Oponent's Argument Against Proposition C

Vote "No" on "Funny-Money" Proposition C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural result of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices,

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "No" on Equipment Lease-Financing.
Vote "No" on Proposition C.
Also vote "No" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Man
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committee Man
John Riordan
Past College Board President
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

Rebuttal to Oponent's Argument Against Proposition C

Vote Yes on Proposition C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

Vote Yes on Proposition C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco's public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and "lease financing" plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco's current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren't prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

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

DEScribing and setting forth a proposition to the qualified electors of the city and county of san francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending section 7.309 thereof relating to the financing of the acquisition of equipment.

Note: additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection, provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?  

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

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

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Bierman and Hallinan.
Police Staffing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.

San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.
Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FOOLLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

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

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let's give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Berman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let's set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!!
Our officers deserve it!!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes. The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arco
Member

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

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the “FULL FORCE FUNDING” initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support “FULL FORCE FUNDING” for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.
Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.
Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.
We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.
Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.
Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.
Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.
Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That’s why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

Robertta Boomer
Donald A. Casper
Rose Chuang
James E. Gilleran
Sam T. Harper
Harold Hoogastan
Joanne “Jody” Stevens
Charles J. Wong

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it’s full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? *Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability. VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!*

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy. Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our city facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not reducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narcotics busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?
Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county to be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416 LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.
(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than January 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection. Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.
(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two and one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section.
(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, as adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller.
Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.
(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992–93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

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

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support those continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries. Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. 
Put simply, it is bad government.

It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries' budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.

In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city's bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city's health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: it guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCull, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Maria Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cahen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Boveland, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!

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

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. **Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.**

Former Library Commissioners:
- Ed Bransten
- Raye Richardson
- Dale Carlson
- Jean Kalit
- Edward Callanan
- Steve Coulter
- Marjorie Stern
- Mary Louise Stong
- Virginia Gee
- Ken Romines

---

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open **without raising taxes.** That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — **Vote Yes on Prop E!**

Thelma Fallus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorber
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident's Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

---

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

**Vote Yes on E.**

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

---

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

---

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

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco's branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth. Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go? As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails. Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system. Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn't necessary. But it is. Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases. Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We're promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can't they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children's Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of "Reading Centers", and Books, Books, Books: that's what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that's what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of "direct democracy." Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As a former mayor of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco's public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton

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

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wyley
  Alex Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Culthirst

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorothy Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfsed
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A "Closed" sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Happert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hghts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

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

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don't need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city's fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

---

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco's citizens' organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco's important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program's money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco's changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco's broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library's annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch's operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986-1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn't simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn't possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn't the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of "quick fixes" which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It's not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Quentin L. Kopp

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

PROPOSITION F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

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

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City's $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees will be paid only for the work they perform, earning less than regular full-time employees.

With the City's high unemployment rate, why doesn't San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, earning high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against "Freeloading"
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committee Man
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Woman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

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

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"

Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised!

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!

Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!

Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading"

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.
Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.
Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.
Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.
Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.
The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.
8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.599, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to his/her retirement.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement. (b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to his/her retirement.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

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

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program.

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs.

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate.

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay.

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 - 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 - 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

(a) the overall mission and goals of the department
(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities
(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity
(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2.

Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES →

NO →

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a line-item budget. This line-item budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department’s programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City’s line-item budget and replace it with a mission-driven budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department’s performance in the year before.

The mission-driven budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department’s success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a line-item budget to a mission-driven budget.

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

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.

THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee of California Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President
Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Iiene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member

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

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!

Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control. What a joke!

The change from a “line item” to “mission driven” budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate “missions” and “goals” should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on “research” and “studies” to “implement” a “mission statement.” With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on “mission driven” budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”. Vote “NO” on “G”!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Ario Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

-------

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

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

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden. The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station somewhere else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!

VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport.”

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride AirTrain lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

 Supervisor Carole Migden
 Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
 Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Doris Ward, Assessor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.

But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We’ve paid our fair share!

Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travelers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100–$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodol Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni. The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10–16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100–$400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100–$400 million ($300–$1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 - 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the devious attempts to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!

If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bagicelupi, CPA
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.

It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half-baked.

Vote No on Prop. H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.

It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H. IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. It's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.

Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Thomas F. Hayes
Former BART Director

Patrick J. Dowling
Anne Quiller
Charles J. Sullivan
Mary C. Sullivan
Joan Finucane
Dan Dunnigan
Margaret Mylett
William Fitzgerald
Julia Fitzgerald
Thomas McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Patricia Hayes
Mary O'Donnell
V.P. John Maher Irish-American Political Club

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO's brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner

Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition 1 which takes BART directly into SFO. Don't let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh's plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition 1's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition 1 allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition 1 does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition 1 enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

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

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as “The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance.”

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to be the best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheelchair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission’s determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE
EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT
SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

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

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp  
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “P” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “P” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
- All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
- San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club  
League of Conservation Voters  
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.  
Supervisor Susan Bierman  
Supervisor Bill Maher  
Supervisor Carole Migden  
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition “I” station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/ BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 – $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition “I” requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/ SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition “I” station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition “I” because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent’s Argument Against Proposition I

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

_____________________________

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LETS MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzenstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreaux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants' Association
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part:

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985....

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what's right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let's do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don't be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City's general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City's general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City's general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I's opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don't be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It's vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport's $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included.

A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART's own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let's be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunksky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn't been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don't let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let's move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!
A structural "trace" already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it's time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport. We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won't improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!

Whether you're a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It’s sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don’t want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It’s just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco’s reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!
VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih’s Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let’s Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O’Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don’t be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!
Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn’t in the airport and doesn’t meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let’s do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Welscher, Secretary
Dina Fiegen, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Ahbultin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sabilad

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport's Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We've taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO's people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative's petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won't affect city services or be charge to the General Fund. Please don't be deceived by Proposition I, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I's is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area. VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Clesby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future's course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The "almost at the Airport" BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let's choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART INTO the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H if you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don't have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn't!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired), S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote "YES" on "I"!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART INTO the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the "most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location." Proposition I requires building the BART station in "the airport terminal area" — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport's light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport's 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition "I" would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
• The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport? If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:

It costs more, but is less convenient.

It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.

And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus

Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!
- If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanne Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES  NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot

On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
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I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.
This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J. San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM's while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM's.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM's is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can't help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn't be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People who make legitimate use of ATM's feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Miller  
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck  
President, Waldeck's Office Supply

George Michael Patterson  
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person's basic rights.

Vote Yes on "J"

Glenda C. Powell  
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber  
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo  
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a minefield. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition says we would violate panhandler's civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who's civil rights are being violated?
We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven't been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President  
Save Our Streets  
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales  
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

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

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City pays for each homeless person on the city’s payroll, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to return the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homelessness program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I propose reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources. Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment. You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club

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

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.
The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
• chat with a friend,
• distribute flyers,
• sip coffee,
• hail a cab,
• gather petition signatures, or
• read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)
AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

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

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public's safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime-fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

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

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

**June 1, 2, and 3**

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

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

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How "K" Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelssohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright

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

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody's tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assuring over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don't be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

I. tank. M. Jordan
Mayor
San Herman
Chair, Supervisor's Housing and Land Use Committee
Famke Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Renald L. Bancemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

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

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city's ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Briggs
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazeneve
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlin Curtin
Pamela David
Yutum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be. Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

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

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

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

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

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

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

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

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Rental Housing</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission-Driven Budgeting</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Staffing</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition A</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition B</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition C</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition D</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition E</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition F</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition G</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition H</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition I</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition J</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition K</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bonds</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Dispatch Center Financing</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Sup't of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, **take this page with you to the polls**. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

---

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?  
Your return address:  

---

Place 29¢ stamp here.  
Post Office will not deliver mail without postage.

Germaine Q Wong  
San Francisco Registrar of Voters  
City Hall -- Room 158  
400 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA  94102-4691
Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you. The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

**Absentee Ballot Application** - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election sign this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:

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

P.O. Box or Street Number:

City: [ ] State: [ ] Zip Code: [ ]

Check below, if it is true for you:

- [ ] I have moved since the last time I registered to vote. My NEW address is printed below. (Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number:

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9411 [ ]

Zip Code:

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.

- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version. I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish [ ] Chinese [ ]

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

The Date You Signed:

Your Day Time Phone Number:

Your Evening Phone Number:
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER
HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sites</td>
<td>San Francisco Unified Schools</td>
<td>Multiple Poll Workers</td>
<td>Walden House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr) Sign Here

[ ] [ ] [ ]

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Print the Address Where You Live Zip Code

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Day Phone: [ ] [ ] [ ] -- [ ] [ ] [ ] Eve. Phone: [ ] [ ] [ ] -- [ ] [ ] [ ]

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

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

--------------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---------------------------

Assigned Precinct: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Home Precinct: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Affidavit Number: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Clerk: [ ] [ ] Inspector: [ ]

[ ] E.O. Blk. [ ] 6/2 [ ] 6/6 [ ] [ ] [ ] Code [ ] Reg. Attached [ ] [ ] Init'I.

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ........................................... 11-30
2. the location of your polling place; ................................................... 32-33
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ........................................... back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; .................................................................... 8
5. information for disabled voters; .................................................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ................................................... 36
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ................................................... 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and .................................... inside back cover
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting.
28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.¹ Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

¹ Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

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

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

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

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

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

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

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

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:

- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR

- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

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

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

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

第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線撕起選票交給選舉站監護員。

STEP 4
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguéela en el lugar oficial de votación.

Fourth step
After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.
RESPECT for ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE. {DO N'T Y O U T H I N K ? }
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 411
DEVELOPMENTAL PARTY
8th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

GOBERNADOR
Governor

JONATHAN TRIP
Business Consultant
Asesor Comercial

TOM HAYDEN
Senator/Teacher
Senador/Maestro

JOHN GARAMENDI
Insurance Commissioner/Rancher
Comisario de seguros/Ranchero

MARK CALNEY

CHARLES ‘CHUCK’ PINEDA, JR.
Criminal Justice Administrator
Administrador de Justicia Criminal

KATHLEEN BROWN
Treasurer, State of California
Tesorera, Estado de California

VICEGOBERNADOR
Lieutenant Governor

GRAY DAVIS
Controller, State of California
Contralor, Estado de California

PHILIP R. ASHAMALLAH
Engineer, Composer, Songwriter
Ingeniero, Compositor, Escriptor de canciones
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MICHAEL WOO</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educator, College Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educador, Profesor universitario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Secretary State</td>
<td>TONY MILLER</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretario de Estado interino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator</td>
<td>GWEN MOORE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legisladora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>DON PERATA</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educator - County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educador - Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman/Legislator</td>
<td>RUSTY AREIAS</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de negocios/Legislator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesswoman, Economist, Educator</td>
<td>KATHLEEN CONNELL</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mujer de negocios, Economista, Educadora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>DAVID ROBERTI</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senador del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>PHIL ANGELIDES</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM UMBERG</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART TORRES</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN KRAFT</td>
<td>Insurance Consultant</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURT MARGOLIN</td>
<td>California State Assemblyman, 42nd District</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH TAYLOR</td>
<td>Tax Analyst</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHAN KLEHS</td>
<td>Member of the Assembly, California Legislature, 18th District</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>Sales Tax Consultant</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE SIMMONS</td>
<td>State Investigative Auditor</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Political Office</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted J. Andromidas</td>
<td>Sales Consultant</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Davy O'Dowd</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ingraham</td>
<td>United States Representative, District 8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pelosi</td>
<td>Member of Congress</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick C. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### State Assembly

**John L. Burton**  
Incumbent  
Titular 现任者

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### County Central Committee

**Tony Kilroy**  
Civil Engineer / Ingeniero civil / 土木工程师

**Jeanna T. Haney**  
Incumbent / Titular / 现任者

**David A. Hoag**  
Field Representative / Representante de campo / 代表

**Ilene Hernandez**  
Law Enforcement Counselor / Consejero de acatamiento de la ley / 基法部门辅导员

**Bob Geary**  
Police/ventriloquist/puppeteer / Policía/Ventrílocuo / Titiritero / 警察/口技表演者/木偶表演员

**Kenneth J. Miller**  
Campaign Consultant / Asesor de la campaña / 竞选顾问

**Elaine Collins McBride**  
Incumbent / Titular / 现任者

**Claire Zvanski**  
Incumbent / Titular / 现任者

**Arlo Smith**  
Incumbent / Titular / 现任者

**Alexa Smith**  
Incumbent / Titular / 现任者

**Sid Smith**  
Youth Organizer / Organizador de la juventud / 青少年组织者

**Gerry Schlueter**  
Public Relations Director / Director de Relaciones Públicas / 公共关系主任

**John Kiordan**  
Incumbent / Titular / 现任者

**Evan Rosen**

**Lee Ann Hanna Prifti**  
City Treasurer Aide / Asistente al Tesorero de la Ciudad / 市财政助理

**Elliot Brandt**  
Non-profit Program Developer / Desarrollador de programas sin fines de lucro / 非牟利计划发展人

**Connie O'Connor**  
Incumbent / Titular / 现任者

**Andrew De La Rosa**  
District Attorney Investigator / Investigador para el Fiscal del Distrito / 地方检察官调查员

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vote for No More than 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT
Consolidated Primary Election, June 7, 1994
City and County of San Francisco

### NONPARTISAN BALLOT
**Balota Aportidaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA</td>
<td>DELAINE EASTIN (Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleista / 教师-女代表)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER (Teacher)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL (Retired Judge)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEWIS S. KEIZER (Educator)</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERRY L. MARTIN (Engineer)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE (Research Engineer)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO (Consultant)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILBERT SMITH (Businessman)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART (Teacher)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAL RICE (High School Teacher)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN (Teacher)</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN G. DIMARCO (Secretary)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHOOL

**ASSESOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSESOR</td>
<td>DORIS M. WARD (Teacher)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY AND COUNTY

**DEFENSOR PUBLICO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN (Defensor Publico)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote por Uno
Vote for One
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

YES 159
NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

YES 163
NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

YES 169
NO 170
BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que sufran de los mismos a la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crean trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparan trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al círculo y a las pendientes al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

---

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que sufran de los mismos a la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crean trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparan trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al círculo y a las pendientes al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

---

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que sufran de los mismos a la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crean trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparan trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al círculo y a las pendientes al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.
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175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 – 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre las aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Permíte que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).
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178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
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 направлен

211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反对

EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raiz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

 направлен

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反对

ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligir daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

 направлен

224 SI 贊成
225 NO 反对

LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENOS DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTORICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

 направлен
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

10E

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
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A  SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

YES 237  NO 238

B  Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

YES 244  NO 245

C  Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES 251  NO 252

D  Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES 256  NO 257
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BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

251 SI 贊成
252 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?

256 SI 贊成
257 NO 反對

180527

FaN
E  Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?  

YES 263  
NO 264  

F  Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?  

YES 270  
NO 271  

G  Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?  

YES 274  
NO 275  

H  Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?  

YES 278  
NO 279  

I  Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?  

YES 283  
NO 284
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  

[Vote Options: YES 289, NO 290]

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled? 

[Vote Options: YES 295, NO 296]

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反對

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se quedan dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona está usando dicha máquina?

有人在使用自動提款機(‘ATM’)提款時，如果有人在30尺內閒遊散
漫超過一分鐘，應否予以禁止?

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反對

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas anclanas o incapacitadas?

應否授權獲得州公共機構資助的
公私發起人在舊金山市、縣發
展、建築或購買低租房屋，為低
收入的個人和家庭，包括老年人
或殘障人士提供數逾3,000個廉租
住宅單位?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
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INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE
BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACIÓN QUE
SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE
VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN
LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en
la Balota Oficial, perfóre la tarjeta de balota en el lugar
señalado con una flecha al lado del número que
corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el
nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el
espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la
porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un
dandidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfóre la tarjeta de
balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del
número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de
balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la
perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del
consello del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva
tarjeta.

 permite: 請用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切
勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用罷針在該候選人的姓名對
面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫
入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用罷針在箭頭所指號碼 "YES"
或 "NO" 打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你捏過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，
請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE
FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

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

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor's office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Conn, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Morl, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorle, 135 Gardendale Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cheryl A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College
    Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

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

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

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

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

“Opponent’s Argument”

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

Rebuttal Arguments

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

Paid Arguments

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

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

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

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

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

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

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
School Bonds

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools. “Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s "politics as usual".

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.
- Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

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

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings.

By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

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

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote Yes on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

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

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn't it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren't running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that's the fallacy of Proposition A.

It's no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco's schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco's public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn't working, it won't get you anywhere.

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don't have to pay? Everyone's quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn't do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That's why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we've shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn't it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn't their priorities be increasing student's test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

Taxpayers deserve more accountability! PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It's not the doors that need rehabilitating!

San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children's Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O'Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It's time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions. It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF VOTING THEREON; AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of the City and County of San Francisco the proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

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

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

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

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

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

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

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

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

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

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

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($23.7 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.

47
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco's 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let's send a message to City Hall. We're tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents' arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco's 911 problems can't be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.
Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.
Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City's Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION C
Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

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

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

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

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

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Woman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

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

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970’s was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

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

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES  ➡️  NO  ➡️

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

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

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.
San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes. Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FooLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

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

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let's give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level. They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.
Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.

This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!

The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.

The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Crystine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member

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

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.
Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city's deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.
Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.
We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.
Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.
Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

AI Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.
Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

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

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.
Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds 1/2 cent sales tax were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Ammendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Ammendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period. That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to its full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

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

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy. Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narcotics busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?
Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL

(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.

(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this Section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.

(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.

(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 - 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 - 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416 LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January, 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1993. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal years 1993 - 1995).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 - 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 - 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 - 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 - 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 - 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

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

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government's priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco's Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E.
Put simply, it is bad government.
It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.
In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:
- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.
If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.
Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’re got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.
Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.
Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.
Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.
Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
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As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Ario Smith, District Attorney

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egerl, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grinstead, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steinman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Robert Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. **Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.**

Former Library Commissioners:
- Ed Bransten
- Raye Richardson
- Dale Carlson
- Jean Kahl
- Edward Callanan
- Steve Coulter
- Marjorie Stern
- Mary Louise Stong
- Virginia Gee
- Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mollone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open **without raising taxes.** That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — **Vote Yes on Prop E!**

Thelma Falts
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

**Vote Yes on E.**

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community, and background felt that people, not politics, should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramon
Theodore Seton
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The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please Join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazekowski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lula Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurkar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A "Closed" sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monei, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city's neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We're not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today's budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that's needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It's a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O'Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
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Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp
Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? YES ☐ NO ☐

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

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

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

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

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

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!
Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.
Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.
What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!
But are you surprised!
This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.
Say "NO" to double-dipping!
Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading"
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.
The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.
To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.
Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.
What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?
Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.
Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

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

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certified employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certified employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certified position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION F (Continued)

made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment. □
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

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

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller's issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has exceeded the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

a) the overall mission and goals of the department
b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities
e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity
f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity
h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall henceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

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

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book *Reinventing Government*, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 -- “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two-feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee Member of California Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member

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

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!
Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.
What a joke!
The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".
Vote "NO" on "G"!
Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.
Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.
The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.
The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City.
Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City's budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need "Neighborhood-Based Budgeting":

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn't.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government's wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!
Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs "reinventing" more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City's budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs? YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

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

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:
- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

 Supervisor Carole Migden
 Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
 Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.
San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system. But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We’ve paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.
We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.
That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can't afford to approve any scheme that's proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that's really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

• Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won't cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won't jeopardize the future of the airport!
• Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don't want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport's 31,000 employees to their job sites.
• Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn't leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn't cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There's been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can't afford to raise taxes or raid the City's general fund to pay for it if there's a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city's general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly; Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis; Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes; North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong; Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition "H" assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:
• A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SanTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 - 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
• A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn't a BART extension to the terminal area be the "most cost-effective and convenient"?
• The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
• The $100 - $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SanTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
• If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 - $400 million ($300 - $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area's economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT'S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don't want a station that's going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let's help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
    Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!

San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!

A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION 11!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!

If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
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Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep's clothing: it's not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars. It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don't get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O'Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world's "Number One Tourist Destination," and one of the world's leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn't provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET'S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIocy THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They've spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn't address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 230,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Cortis
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s
the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving
Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast,
convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a
mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. Prop. I is an intelligent vision for San
Francisco and the Bay Area. It’s plan brings BART directly under
the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the
largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes
an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop.
I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50
feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO —
VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN
INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport,
forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of
public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the
Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals
— just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s
brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage
check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND
CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST
ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND
“NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don't let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network

Frank J. Murphy
Babette Dreifke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT:

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

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;
(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;
(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall not divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.

☐
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE
EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT
SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

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

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “I” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot. 9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 – $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition “I” station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition “I” because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote NO on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent’s Argument Against Proposition I

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

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET'S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollock
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreaux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants' Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part: "WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage. WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million. WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985... "RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Stiggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It's vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strusky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

---

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

---

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport. We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy

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

It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hsieh's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

VOTE YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't' be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!
Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.
Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbageleta, Realtor
Anna Barbageleta, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former "tightwad Supervisor," is no spendthrift. He's for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Ahbolin, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don't always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it's about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchhai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club.
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it's the right thing for San Franciscans.

I've been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grandchild, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Carolina del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession. San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider

Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider

Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist

Richmond Young
HIV Task Force

Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist

Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation

Les Pappas
AIDS Educator

Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restauranteur

Ben Hom
Businessman

Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner

Joe Kwok
Businessman

Jonathan Leong
Businessman

Eric Chung
Businessman

Anton Qiu
Realtor

Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA

David E. Lee
Community Activist

Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of
Permit Appeals

Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission

Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Florence Fang
Businesswoman

Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police

Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims

Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertole
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bhalley
Jonathan Bhalley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson  
Keith Consoer, Pres  
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors  
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.  
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors  
Barbara R. Meskunas  
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street  
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA  
Dorice Murphy  
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.

• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.

• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.

• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.

NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment

John Holteclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.

• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.

• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.

• The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.

• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.

• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holteclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Jeffrey H enn, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don't be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that's much more convenient.

What's more, Proposition I doesn't offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don't have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there's a magic pot of $300 million out there, we'd rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
- It costs more, but is less convenient.
- It costs more, but won't get people out of their cars.
- And there's no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women's Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

• If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

• If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!

• If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Milgrom, Chair
Lula Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be Fiscally irresponsible to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.

2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.

3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh  
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown  
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot

On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City's multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 130 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won't make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn't prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can't do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won't have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM's really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM's? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a "safety" zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM's. The Mayor's law seeks to play on the public's emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM's. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let's not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let's ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J. San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable. You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply

Geroge Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

 Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition says we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state!

Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.

Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.

You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians' claims that it "won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens," read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially "off-limits" for ordinary citizens. New "no lingering" zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.
The only people authorized to "linger" in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that "can be conducted" outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of "lingering" to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely "lingering" or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to "move along." Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of "no lingering" zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be "in your face" at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote "NO" on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121
THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

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

Section I. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines impair the public’s safety and welfare.
Cash dispensing machines have become a site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine.

Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accu- satory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

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

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

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

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

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
Oponent's Argument Against Proposition K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

*Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check.* Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

**Vote NO on Proposition K.**

Citizens for Orderly Growth

Alexa Smith  
Democratic Central Committee Member

Arlo Hale Smith  
Democratic Central Committeeeman

Terence Faulkner  
Former Executive Committeeeman of California Republican Party

Robert Silvestri  
Republican Central Committeeeman

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition K

Proposition K will not increase anybody's tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don't be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan  
Mayer

Sue Bierman  
Chair, Supervisor's Housing and Land Use Committee

Randy Shaw  
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Ronald E. Bansemer  
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing.
Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers.
Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

---

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

---

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigade
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yuttum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

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

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals and my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend.
We're open 7 days a week,
12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

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

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice.
Write the number that matches your choice of “YES” or “NO” for each State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATE PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCAL PROPOSITIONS**

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

To save time and reduce waiting lines, **take this page with you to the polls.** Show your mailing label to the poll worker.
The location of your **Polling Place** is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

---

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?
Your return address:

---

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691

---

Place 29¢ stamp here.
Post Office will not deliver mail without postage.
**OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS**  
City and County of San Francisco  
Room 158 - City Hall  
400 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691  
(415) 554-4375

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>Democratic Party</th>
<th>Precincts Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 411         | 8th Congressional District  
8th State Senate District  
12th Assembly District | 2001 through 2216  
2701 through 2714  
2901 through 2919 |

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you. The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

---

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION** - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election

**SIGN** this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

**Check one below:**

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

**P.O. Box or Street Number**:  

**City**  

**State**  

**Zip Code**

**Check below, if it is true for you:**

- [ ] I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.  
  My **NEW** address is printed below.  
  (Residence address ONLY.)

**Number and Street Name, Apartment Number**:  

**SA N FR ANCISCO, CA**  

**Zip Code**

**Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.**

- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version.
  I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish___, Chinese___

**You MUST SIGN** here to receive a ballot.

**Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT**  

**To contact you if there is a problem with your application:**

**The Date You Signed**  

**Your Day Time Phone Number**  

**Your Evening Phone Number**
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q. WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
### Polling Place/Poll Worker Honor Roll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Multi Sites | San Francisco Unified Schools | Multi Poll Workers | Walden House |

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for **all** of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

### Equal Civic Duty Opportunity - Sign Up Today

#### Registrar of Voters - Poll Worker Application

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr):**

**Your Signature:**

**Print Your First Name:**

**Print Your Last Name:**

**Print the Address Where You Live:**

**Zip Code:**

**Day Phone:**

**Eve. Phone:**

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:

- [ ] Cantonese
- [ ] Mandarin
- [ ] Spanish
- [ ] Vietnamese
- [ ] Russian
- [ ] Other:

---

**Space Below - For Use by Registrar of Voters**

**Assigned Precinct:**

**Home Precinct:**

**Affidavit Number:**

Clerk: [ ]

Inspector: [ ]

- [ ] E.O. Bk.
- [ ] 6/2
- [ ] 6/6

**Code:**

Reg. Attached: [ ]

Initl.: [ ]

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102.
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28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.¹ Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

¹ Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
**ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER**
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

**BEFORE ELECTION DAY:**

**ABSENTEE VOTING** — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

**TAPE RECORDINGS** — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

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

**ON ELECTION DAY:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER**

**PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS**

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

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

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

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

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

**IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS**

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EMERGENCY VOTING
If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
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The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

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

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

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

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

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手法票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Aségúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabezitas rojas.

第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

第三步
请把带銻之選舉針，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

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

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虚線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。

STEP 4

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.
Respect for animals should be human nature.

{Don't you think?}

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork composed by Monteflye Prepress Services.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 412
DEMOCRATIC PARTY
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文说明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

GOBERNADOR
Governor

JONATHAN TRIP
Business Consultant
Asesor comercial 商業顧問

TOM HAYDEN
Senator/Teacher
Senador/Maestro 州衆議員／教師

JOHN GARAMENDI
Insurance Commissioner/Rancher
Comisionado de seguros/Ranchero 保險委員／牧場主

MARK CALNEY

CHARLES 'CHUCK' PINEDA, JR.
Criminal Justice Administrator
Administrador de Justicia Criminal 刑事執法主管

KATHLEEN BROWN
Treasurer, State of California
Tesorera, Estado de California 加州州司庫

VICEGOBERNADOR
Lieutenant Governor

GRAY DAVIS
Controller, State of California
Contralor, Estado de California 加州主計官

PHILIP R. ASHAMALLAH
Engineer, Composer, Songwriter
Ingeniero, Compositor, Escritor de canciones 工程師、作曲家、歌曲作者
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MICHAEL WOO</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educator, College Teacher Educador, Profesor universitario 教育工作者、大学教師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>TONY MILLER</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Secretary State Secretario de Estado interino 代州務卿</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>GWEN MOORE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legisladora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>DON PERATA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educator - County Supervisor Educador - Supervisor del Condado 教育工作者 - 縣參議員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>RUSTY AREIAS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman/Legislator Hombre de negocios/Legislator 商人／立法人員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>KATHLEEN CONNELL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businesswoman, Economist, Educator Mujer de negocios, Economista, Educadora 女商人，經濟學者，教育工作者</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>DAVID ROBERTI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Senator Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>PHIL ANGELIDES</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de negocios 商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>TOM UMBERG</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>California State Assemblyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asamblesta del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>ART TORRES</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senador del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN KRAFT</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Insurance Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asesor de seguros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURT MARGOLIN</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>California State Assemblyman, 42nd District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asamblesta del Estado de California, Distrito 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Equalization</td>
<td>RICH TAYLOR</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Tax Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analista de impuestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHAN KLEHS</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Member of the Assembly, California Legislature, 18th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea, Legislatura de California, Distrito 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Sales Tax Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asesor de impuesto a las ventas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE SIMMON</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State Investigative Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor Investigativo del Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Senator, United States Senator</td>
<td>DIANNE FEINSTEIN</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TED J. ANDROMIDAS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANIEL DAVY O'DOWD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Representative, United States Representative, District 12</td>
<td>TOM LANTOS</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator, District 8</td>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

### STATE ASSEMBLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. BURTON</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titular 現任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Central Committee</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer / Ingeniero civil / 土木工程師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEANNA T. HANEY</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 現任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID A. HOAG</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Representative / Representante de campo / 代表</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILENE HERNANDEZ</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Counselor / Consejero de acatamiento de la ley / 執法部門輔導員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policeman/Ventilguist-Puppeteer / Policía/Ventilguero - Titiritero / 警員／口技表演者 — 木偶劇演員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH J. MILLER</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Consultant / Asesor de la campaña / 競選顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAINE COLLINS MCBRIDE</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 現任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIRE ZVANSKI</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 現任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 現任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXA SMITH</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 現任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID SMITH</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Organizer / Organizador de la juventud / 青少年組織者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERRY SCHLUTER</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Director / Director de Relaciones Públicas / 公共關係主任</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORDAN</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 現任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAN ROSEN</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE ANN HANNA PRIFTI</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Treasurer Aide / Asistente al Tesorero de la Ciudad / 市司庫助理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIOT BRANDT</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit Program Developer / Desarrollador de programas sin fines de lucro / 非牟利計劃發展人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O'CONNOR</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 現任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW DE LA ROSA</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney Investigator / Investigador para el Fiscal del Distrito / 地方檢察官調查員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT
### CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
### CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

### NONPARTISAN BALLOT
**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DELAINE EASTIN</td>
<td>Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleísta / 教師 - 女議員</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS S. KEIZER</td>
<td>Educator / Educador / 教育工作者</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRY L. MARTIN</td>
<td>Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE</td>
<td>Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO</td>
<td>Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者 - 管理顧問</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILBERT SMITH</td>
<td>Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 商人，教育工作者</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT 'BOB' STEWART</td>
<td>Teacher / Maestro / 教師</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAL RICE</td>
<td>High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 高中教師</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN</td>
<td>Teacher/School Trustee / Maestra/Síndico escolar / 教師 / 校董</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN G. DIMARCO</td>
<td>Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育內閣秘書</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Assessor / Asesor / 估税官</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco / Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco / 公共辯護律師</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program. YES 159 NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement. YES 163 NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead. YES 169 NO 170
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1A

159 SI 贅成
160 NO 反对

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISÌSICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Esta acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B

163 SI 贅成
164 NO 反对

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que sujeto de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C

169 SI 贅成
170 NO 反对

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de técnicas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejor en y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparan trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a la violencia al asegurar la entrada de la educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las escuelas universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras en la modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.
175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1996 – 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime de las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD, ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escuelas y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT.
LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitu-
tion to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation
equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact:
Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up
to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school
districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT.
Provided for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree
murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at
another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury.
Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVA-
TION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorized bond issuance of
almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated
areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay
off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds.
Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to
operate and maintain properties.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

EXCLUSIÓN TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD, EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista en la instalación de equipos para conservación de aguas según lo define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrán sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反對

ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infiligrar daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對

LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

224 SI 贊成
225 NO 反對

[Page 23]
178
PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179
MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180
PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反對

EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anualmente. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對

ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligir daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

224 SI 贊成
225 NO 反對

LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.
A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

YES 237
NO 238

B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

YES 244
NO 245

C

Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES 251
NO 252

D

Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES 256
NO 257
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CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
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237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadora, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

251 SI 贊成
252 NO 反對

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

256 SI 贊成
257 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

E  Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

   YES 263  NO 264

F  Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

   YES 270  NO 271

G  Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

   YES 274  NO 275

H  Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

   YES 278  NO 279

I  Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

   YES 283  NO 284
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263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abierta una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反對

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de items sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES 289
NO 290

K
Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES 295
NO 296
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289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反对

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

有人在使用自動提款機(ATM)提款時，如果有人在50尺內停留散落超過一分鐘，應否予以禁止?

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反对

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

應否授權獲州政府資金救助的
公私單位在舊金山市、縣發展
建築或購買廉租房屋，為低
收入的個人和家庭，包括老年人
或殘障人士提供數達5,000個廉租
住宅單位?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
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INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE
BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE
SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE
VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN
LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en
la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar
señalado con una flecha al lado del número que
corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el
nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el
espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la
porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un
dandidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de
balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del
número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradora en la tarjeta de
balota. Dichas marcas o borradoras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la
perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del
consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva
tarjeta.

選民須知:

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切
勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對
面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫
入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”
或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你摳過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，
請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE
FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

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

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor's office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Malillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporation President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hilanitas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumashero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Morf, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender’s office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Glorgi, 135 Gardenside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cheryl A. Jefferson, 1359 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 365 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodri, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BACKGROUND

What Is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the City’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a "Yes" vote means, and what a "No" vote means. There is a statement by the City's Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

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

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

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

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

"Proponent's Argument"

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

"Opponent's Argument"

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

Rebuttal Arguments

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

Paid Arguments

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

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

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

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

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or re- construction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

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

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

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

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling "temporary" bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City's economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: "As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs...but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

"Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...""

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O'Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O'Connell.

It's "politics as usual".

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- "Contracting out" routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
School Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city. The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

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

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid's future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children's educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City's economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children's education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

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

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.
I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A
If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.

It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.
On its face, Proposition A is a good idea . . . the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. *Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay?* Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!
A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!
We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! Taxpayers deserve more accountability! PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance. Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.
Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.
In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical.”

THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.
Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.
I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.
What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.
As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

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

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco's prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions. It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can't make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting **No on Proposition A**.

*David Gruber*
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
Calling and Providing for a Special Election to Be Held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 7, 1994, for the Purpose of Submitting to the Voters of the City and County of San Francisco a Proposition to Incur the Following Bonded Debt of the City and County for the Acquisition, Construction or Completion by the City and County of San Francisco of the Following Municipal Improvements, to wit: Ninety-Five Million Dollars ($95,000,000) for Acquisition, Construction and/or Reconstruction of Certain Improvements for the San Francisco Unified School District; and that the Estimated Cost of City and County of Said Municipal Improvements is and will be too great to be paid out of the Ordinary Annual Income and Revenue of the City and County and will require Expenditures greater than the AmountAllowed Therefor by the Annual Tax Levy; Reciting the Estimated Costs of Such Municipal Improvements; Fixing the Date of Election and the Manner of Holding Such Election and the Procedure for Voting for or Against the Proposition; Fixing the Maximum Rate of Interest on Said Bonds and Providing for the Levy and Collection of Taxes to Pay Both Principal and Interest Thereon; Prescribing Notice to Be Given of Such Election; Consolidating the Special Election with the General Election; and Providing That the Election Precincts, Voting Places and Officers for Election Shall be the Same as for Such General Election.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated: San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

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

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

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

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

 Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

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

"San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

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

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

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

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations of or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW:
The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.
Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco's 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g., Commercial Street).

Let's send a message to City Hall. We're tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check? VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilie Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

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

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.

Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.

Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.

Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

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

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

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPONEE'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONEE'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Committeewoman
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE “NO” ON “FUNNY-MONEY” PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called “Equipment Lease-Financing” and other “funny-money” credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to “anticipate” local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of “credit card government” with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970’s was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit “games” to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more “funny-money” credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote “NO” on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote “NO” on Proposition C.

Also vote “NO” on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
John Riordan
Past College Board President
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and "lease financing" plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

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

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20,000,000 of such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
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PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?  

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

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

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Bierman and Hallinan.
Police Staffing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.

San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes. Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FOOLIED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

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

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons
Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers. This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!

The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.

The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarino
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the “FULL FORCE FUNDING” initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support “FULL FORCE FUNDING” for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.
Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.
Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.
We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.
Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.
Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.
Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident
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**Police Staffing**

**PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

*Susan Horsfall*

*Nothing* is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical *Full Force* Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their *top concern*. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

*Supervisor Annemarie Conroy*

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Duggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.
Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

*Joe Konopka, President*
*RAD*

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. **Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.**
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. **We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt.** Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
*Irene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance*
*Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee*
*Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party*
*Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force*
*Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association*
*George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants*
*Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors*
*Ron Norlin*
*Glenda Powell*
*Krista Huntsman*
*Micheal & Barbara Russell*

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Ammendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where they needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

*Michael A. Fluke, President*
*Save Our Streets*
*Tenants & Merchants Assoc.*
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That’s why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period. That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderweld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it’s full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say no and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote NO on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narcs busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL.

(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.

(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.

(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.

(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416

LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expanding fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992–93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

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

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours.

Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

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

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government. It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million. In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police offers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition. If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children — a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Suebe Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: it guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Boveland, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Sauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kail
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Strong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident's Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade.

Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth. Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth. Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges VOTE YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonita Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bostia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A "Closed" sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city's neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We're not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today's budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that's needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It's a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifi, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezei
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asava
Joe O'Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchay
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn't have as many books, and librarians were banished.

"We want to go to the library!" the children cried. "Not today," replied the unhappy parents. "The library isn't open in the afternoon anymore."

The people protested, "This isn't fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn." The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

"No way," the king proclaimed. "I'll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I'll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I'll stop planting flowers in the park."

This made the children very sad. "Why is the king so mean?" they asked.

The people were very angry. They deposed the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
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Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines, or health centers, or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail.

Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straightjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986—1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Quentin L. Kopp
Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

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

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
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PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPO-
RARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F
WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING!"

Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised?

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!

Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!

Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading"

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government’s labor costs.
Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.
Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.
Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.
Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for taxpayers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

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

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons

(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:

(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system.

(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in Section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in Section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation or benefit, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation or benefit by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolition.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation or benefit, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation or benefit by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolition.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

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

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates
The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:
(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;
(b) Statement of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;
(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;
(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;
(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget
Beginning in fiscal year 1995–96 and no later than fiscal year 1997–98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:
(a) the overall mission and goals of the department
(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities
(e) the strategic plans that guide each program or activity
(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments
It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains
Within thirty days of the Controller's issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
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PROPOSITION G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

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

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services.

The City's current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public's needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to "reinvent" government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a "Mission Driven Budget" is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — "Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations").

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service "deadwood", seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special "WARNING TO VOTERS" page in the front of this "Voters Handbook".

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — "rule-driven" San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their "BooDle Board" of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

---

VOTE "NO" ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee of California Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

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

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!
Proposition “G” is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.
What a joke!
The change from a “line item” to “mission driven” budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate “missions” and “goals” should be.
About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on “research” and “studies” to “implement” a “mission statement.” With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on “mission driven” budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”.
Vote "NO" on "G"!
Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.
Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.
The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.
Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.
The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

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

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

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

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “H” Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocations the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

• Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.

• Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.

• Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duty adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

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

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.

But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We've paid our fair share.
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city's general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We're sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don't have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That's a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don't need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for these community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for CalTrain (electric-trified, extended downtown, on BART schedules). BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT'S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco's transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city's history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city's General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don't allow the doommakers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn't even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!
If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species. Vote NO on Proposition H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep's clothing: it's not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat! Please vote NO on Proposition H!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars. It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service. Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests. Don't get fooled, taxed or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half-baked.

Vote No on Prop. H.

Joe O'Donaghy
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world's "Number One Tourist Destination," and one of the world's leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn't provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET'S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They've spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn't address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.

It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H. IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. It's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO's brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. "YES" ON I AND "NO" on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Position I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka
Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Española Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Mine
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

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

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SanTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission’s determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officials and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE
EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT
SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

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

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.
BART to the Airport

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco's reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport's $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport's operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SFO's General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport's expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let's seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It's the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.

• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.

• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport work-places outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some pas-sengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease rider-ship and reduce MUNI funding. Vote NO on wasteful spending.

Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

**Frank Jordan**  
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

**Lee Goland**  
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 1.8 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an auspicious set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION II!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association  
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station near Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you right into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

**Richard M. Hills, Attorney**  
**Curt Holzinger, Architect**

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

**Robert P. Varni**  
Community College District Trustee

**Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.**  
Businessman

**Peter M. Finnegan**  
Former Community College Trustee

**Jeffrey L. Pollack**  
Restaurateur

**Daniel Vien-Chevieux**  
Businessman

**Dylan Sanders**  
Businessman

**Elena L. Graceman**  
Businesswoman

**George Semivan**  
Businessman

**Kenneth Burger**  
President

Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part:

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.
WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.
WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what's right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let's do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don't be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City's general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City's general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City's general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Feltzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I's opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don't be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included.

A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strusky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco.

We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinonza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate
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It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hsieh's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!
Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!
Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.
Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.
Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway. Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.
And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.
Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegner, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Ahboltin, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst. — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchay, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce

President, Bay View District Democratic Club

Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club

Millie Francois
Brian Francois

Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.
I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

• The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.

• The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.

• Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fong, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumber-some transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

---

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Cartola del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider

Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider

Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist

Richmond Young
HIV Task Force

Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist

Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation

Les Pappas
AIDS Educator

Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restaurateur
Ben Hon
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qua
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA

David E. Lee
Community Activist

Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals

Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission

Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Florence Fang
Businesswoman

Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deputize BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police

Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims

Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future's course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The "almost at the Airport" BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let's choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don't have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn't!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART Into the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART Into the Airport. Vote "YES" on "I"!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Vergez, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat's meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT'S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.

NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “T” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What's more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.
Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Woman’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- **If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says that San Francisco must take "all necessary actions" to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

- **If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!

- **If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

**PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN.** The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

**Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service.** State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. **Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport,** and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be **Fiscally Irresponsible** to spend money we don’t have. **Vote NO on Proposition I.**

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.
1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.
   The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SanTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
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PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

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

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How “J” Got on the Ballot

On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City's multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won't make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn't prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can't do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won't have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM's really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM's? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a "safety" zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM's. The Mayor's law seeks to play on the public's emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM's. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let's not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let's ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPOENENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandleings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM's feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

**Richard C. Millet**
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

**Clifford Waldeck**
President, Waldeck's Office Supply

**Geroge Michael Patterson**
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

**Karim Al Salma**

---

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person's basic rights.

Vote Yes on "J"

**Glenda C. Powell**
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

**Connie Ramirez Webber**
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

**Alex Romo**
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

---

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

**Manuel A. Rosales**
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy. **THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.**

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.**

**Supervisor Bill Maher**

---

The opposition say's we would violate panhandler's civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who's civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven't been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

**Michael A. Fluke,** President

**Save Our Streets**

**Tenants and Merchants Assoc.**
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Vote No on Proposition J!
Proposition J wastes precious police resources.
Laws already exist to protect ATM users.
Proposition J violates the First Amendment.
You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.
Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

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

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public's safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each violation violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each violation violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

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

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

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES ➡️

NO ➡️

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance. In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

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

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.
PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody's tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don't be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor's Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

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

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built - at no additional cost to taxpayers.
Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.
Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yuttum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

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

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects.
The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer's Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.
The City should let the public participate and make the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club-Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork composed by MasterType Prepress Services.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

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

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

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

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

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**PARTY CANDIDATES** - Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

| COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE |
| Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Sept of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| STATE PROPOSITIONS |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

To save time and reduce waiting lines, **take this page with you to the polls**. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your **Polling Place** is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

---

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

Your return address:

---

**Place 29¢ stamp here.**

Post Office will not deliver mail without postage.

---

Germaine Q. Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

---

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION** - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:

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

P.O. Box or Street Number: __________________________
City: __________ State: _______ Zip Code: __________

Check below, if it is true for you:

- [ ] I have moved since the last time I registered to vote. My NEW address is printed below. (Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number: __________________________
San Francisco, CA: __________________________
Zip Code: 94111

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.

- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version. I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish _______, Chinese _______.

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - **DO NOT PRINT**

The Date You Signed: __________ Year Day Time Phone Number: __________
Your Evening Phone Number: __________
POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
# Polling Place / Poll Worker Honor Roll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Sites  |  San Francisco Unified Schools  |  Multiple Poll Workers  |  Walden House

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

## Equal Civic Duty Opportunity - Sign Up Today

### Registrar of Voters - Poll Worker Application

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)**

|   |   |   | Sign Here

**Print Your First Name**

**Print Your Last Name**

**Print the Address Where You Live**

**Day Phone**

**Eve. Phone**

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

- **I HAVE a car:** □ (Please Check)

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

**Assigned Precinct:**

**Affidavit Number:**

**Home Precinct:**

**Clerk:**

**Inspector:**


Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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# PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:
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28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

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

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

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EMERGENCY VOTING
If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE

Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Recn.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrgeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

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

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.
   If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

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

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

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
   - Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

   OR
   - Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

第一步
请双手将选票插入自动投票机内。

STEP 1

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THEStub OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

第三步
请把带状之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la baleta a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguella en el lugar oficial de votacion.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虛線提出選票交給選舉站監選員。
RESPECT for ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE.

DON'T YOU THINK?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today: 1200 15th Street, S.F. (415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork composed by Magazijje Purpose Studios.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 413
DEMOCRATIC PARTY
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word “YES” or “NO.”

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última página de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

### GOVERNOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Textual Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TOM HAYDEN</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Senator/Teacher</td>
<td>賴選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Insurance Commissioner/Rancher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MARK CALNEY</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Comisionado de seguros/Ranchero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CHARLES ‘CHUCK’ PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KATHLEEN BROWN</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Treasurer, State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>JONATHAN TRIP</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Business Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Textual Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PHILIP R. ASHAMALLAH</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Engineer, Composer, Songwriter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Controller, State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**JUNE 7, 1994**

**ESTATAL**

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY, PARTIDO DEMOCRATA**

**STATE**

**副州長**

**VICEGOBERNADOR**

**Lieutenant Governor**

**哲学**

**Controler, State of California**

**州長**

**GOBERNADOR**

**Governor**

**州議員／教師**

**Criminal Justice Administrator**

**Treasurer, Estado de California**

**Business Consultant**

**Engineer, Composer, Songwriter**

**Ingeniero, Compositor, Escritor de canciones**

**州計官**
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>联合初選</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SECRETARIO DE ESTADO**
Tony Miller
Acting Secretary State
SECRETARY OF STATE
Secretary of State

| 議選一人 |
| Vote for One |
| 28 |

| **LEGISLATOR**
Gwen Moore
Legislator
Legisladora
| 立法人員 |
| 30 |

| **EDUCATOR, COLLEGE TEACHER**
Michael Woo
Educator, College Teacher
EDUCATOR, PROFESOR UNIVERSITARIO |
| 教育工作者，大學教師 |
| 32 |

| **CONTROLLER**
Rusty Areias
Businessman/Legislator
Hombre de negocios/Legislator
| 商人／立法人員 |
| 38 |

| **BUSINESSWOMAN, ECONOMIST, EDUCATOR**
Kathleen Connell
Businesswoman, Economist, Educator
Mujer de negocios, Economista, Educadora
| 女商人，經濟學者，教育工作者 |
| 40 |

| **EDUCATOR - COUNTY SUPERVISOR**
Don Perata
Educator - County Supervisor
EDUCADOR - SUPERVISOR DEL CONDADO
| 教育工作者－縣參議員 |
| 42 |

| **TREASURER**
Phil Angelides
Businessman
Hombre de negocios
| 商人 |
| 48 |

| **CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR**
David Roberti
Senator del Estado de California
<p>| 加州參議員 |
| 50 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>District/Position</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>TOM UMBERG</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California State Assemblyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblesta del Estado de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>JOHN KRAFT</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aesor de seguros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>保险顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURT MARGOLIN</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42nd District</td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California State Assemblyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblesta del Estado de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART TORRES</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senadore del Estado de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization, District 1</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO DE COMPENSACION, DISTRITO 1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Member of the Assembly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Legislature,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN KLEHS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Member of the Assembly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Legislature,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Tax Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asesor de impuesto a las</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ventas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE SIMMONS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Investigative Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor Investigativo del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICH TAYLOR</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analista de impuestos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

## US SENATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TED J. ANDROMIDAS</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asesor de ventas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL DAVY O'DOWD</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empresario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIANNE FEINSTEIN</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senadora de los Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## US REPRESENTATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NANCY PELOSI</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Congress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro del Congreso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT INGRAHAM</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STATE SENATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito.

本區並無此職位之競選
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grador, Asamblea de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMITÉ CENTRAL DE CONDADO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LESLIE RACHEL KATZ</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICK HAUPMANN</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Employee / Empleado de una pequeña empresa / 小型企业员工</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARIA MARTINEZ</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAROLE MIGDEN</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLAUDINE CHENG</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights Attorney / Abogado de derechos civiles / 民权律师</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LULU M. CARTER</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RONALD COLTHIRST</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JIM WEST</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de negocios / 商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATTHEW J. ROTHSCILD</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUE BIERMAN</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATALIE BERG</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAMES LEGARE</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARIJO DANIELSON</strong></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Teacher / Maestra de escuela primaria / 小学教师</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREG DAY</strong></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA</td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEWIS S. KEIZER Educador / Educador / 教育工作者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERRY L. MARTIN Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程师</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程师</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO Educador-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者-管理顾问</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILBERT SMITH Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 商人、教育工作者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART Teacher / Maestro / 教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAL RICE High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 高中教师</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLORIA MATT TUCHMAN Teacher/School Trustee / Maestra/Síndico escolar / 教师 / 校董</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN G. D'IMARCO Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育内阁秘书</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELAINE EASTIN Teacher - Assemblywoman / Maestra - Asambleísta / 教师-女議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>DORIS M. WARD Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF BROWN Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco / Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

YES 159
NO 160

YES 163
NO 164

YES 169
NO 170
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1A

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las universidades públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 196 universidades y escuelas terciarias incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación y las universidades públicas y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

F7
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

8E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para las demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 - 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVA-
TION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

211 SI [赞成]
212 NO [反对]

**EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.**

Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según lo define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurred por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

218 SI [赞成]
219 NO [反对]

**ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA.**

Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego Intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligirle daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

224 SI [赞成]
225 NO [反对]

**LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA.**

Autoriza la emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $36 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A  SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

YES 237  ↔
NO 238  ↔

B  Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

YES 244  ↔
NO 245  ↔

C  Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES 251  ↔
NO 252  ↔

D  Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES 256  ↔
NO 257  ↔
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyan modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

¿Desea que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
11E

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

E
Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

YES 263
NO 264

F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES 270
NO 271

G
Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES 274
NO 275

H
Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES 278
NO 279

I
Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES 283
NO 284
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

263 SI 賛成
264 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga abierta una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 賛成
271 NO 反對

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que fengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 賛成
275 NO 反對

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 賛成
279 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 賛成
284 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
SAMPLE BALLOT
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  YES 289  NO 290

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?  YES 295  NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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F12
有人在使用自動提款機(ATM)取款時，如果有人在30尺內周遊散
積極超越一分鐘，應當予以禁止?

J

289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反對

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se
queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero
automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra
persona esté usando dicha máquina?

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反對

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la
asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan
la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de
viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San
Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3,000 unidades de
alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias
de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas
o incapacitadas?

K

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dándidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

Instrucciones en English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE
FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.
The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.
The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor's office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alloto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hilititus St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrade St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grottan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender’s office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorghi, 135 Gardeside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cheryl A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City's cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today's dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY'S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond "debt service" during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. ("Debt Service" is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city's outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children's fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor's calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a "Yes" vote means, and what a "No" vote means. There is a statement by the City's Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

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

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

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

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

"Proponent's Argument"

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

"Opponent's Argument"

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

Rebuttal Arguments

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

Paid Arguments

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

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

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

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

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City's budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party's candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

The Proposal: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "Yes" Vote Means: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "No" Vote Means: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

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

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

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

Arguments for and against this measure and its full text immediately follow this page.
School Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings. . . ”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Reid Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

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

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it's the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can't keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather "stick it" to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say "No" to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don't believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling "temporary" bungalows at the Richmond District's Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district's John O'Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be "stuck" with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotted floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings.

By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is UNFAIR. On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! Taxpayers deserve more accountability!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating!

San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico

President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent

Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force

Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent

Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident

Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner

Commissioner

San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/ OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, THE VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described.

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

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

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

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

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

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 hereof is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

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

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

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

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

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

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.6 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. **Measure B, disguised as lease financing,** is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should **BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.**

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up **MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.**

Many of the **BUREAUCRATS** running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: **DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT??**

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPOPPENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a “pay as you go” basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco's 911 problems can't be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.
Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.
Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City's Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

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

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?  

YES

NO

---

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

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

---

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

---

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE 'YES' ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Woman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

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

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AmEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

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

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the chart of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?  

YES  

NO  

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

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

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Bierman and Hallinan.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes

San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes. Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BE FooLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION D
In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let's give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman  
Nan McGuire  
David Looman  
Sara Simmons

Tony Kilroy  
Pamela Ayo Yetunde  
Jean Kortum  
Michael Nolan  
Eileen Collins  
Neil Gendel  
Esther Marks  
Dan Dillon  
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: It puts more police on our streets.
By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.
Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.
They are wrong.
It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.
Let's set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.
Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.
I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.
Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.
Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarino
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D'Arcy
Member

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

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit.

"CARPE DIEM."

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schonstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Nee Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.

Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.

This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.

When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.

I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.

The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.

In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.

Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.

We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.

Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.

We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.

Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!

Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period. That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderseld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it's full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

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

DON'T HAN DCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narcs busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electorate of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part I of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.
(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.
Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.
(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levied pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to the annual tax of two and one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter for the purposes specified in this section.
(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.
(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

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

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Police Staffing

needs a full force police department. That fact is not
question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the
Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the
law to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the
council allocated funds for 100 new police officers — and they
failed to do so now.

But, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the
mayor to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your
representatives are looking for an easy way out of their
obligations to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions
about what employees are required to provide adequate
services are being made as the need arises. Adding such require-
ments to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services,
whether or not there is public demand for them. Such mandates constrain
the flexibility and dilute the accountability of the
Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and
Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would
demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:

• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson
at campaign fund-raisers?
• narcotics busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand
the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

We don’t need another Charter amendment.
Proposition D.

Proposition D

President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the
Medical Marijuana law. 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana.
8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana.
Lives have been destroyed. The jails are
filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?
We need the money toward helping people. Let us show the
world that we can make peace in our society. We will all be safer and
happier.

Americans for Compassionate Use.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL

(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.

(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.

(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.

(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal years 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416

LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of (two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departmenst or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992-93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992-93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries need to remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

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

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

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994-95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994-95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994-95 and 2009-10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How "E" Got on the Ballot
On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government.

It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.

In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filbey
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children — a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sebene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Keen, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Bureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCaill, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steinman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. **Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.**

Former Library Commissioners:
- Ed Bransten
- Raye Richardson
- Dale Carlson
- Jean Kalil
- Edward Callanan
- Steve Coulter
- Marjorie Stern
- Mary Louise Stong
- Virginia Gee
- Ken Romines

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open **without raising taxes**. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — **Vote Yes on Prop E!**

_thelma fallis_
_barbara elias-baker, senior action network_
_joe lacey, old st. mary’s housing committee_
_faye lacey, senior action network_
_rod rodigues_
_landis whistler, the neighborhoods together_
_tatiana lorbert_
_gerda fiske_
_jeremiah sullivan_
_robert pender, park merced resident’s organization_
_jack coll, retired librarian_

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. **Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.**

_dr. rose resnick_
_rudy mellone_
_library for the blind_

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

**Vote Yes on E.**

_joel ventresca_
_budget and policy analyst_

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

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorrwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurari
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cumlin
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lula Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zanvetski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosta
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Colthirst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. **For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.**

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College  
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco  
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education  
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education  
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education  
Dr. Carlaota del Portillo, SF Board of Education  
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education  
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education  
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board  
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board  
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board  
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board  
Rodol Rodis, SF Community College Board

---

**Good Government Provides Good Libraries!**

**Good government** ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! **Good government** means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. **Good government** works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

**Good government** does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! **Good government** does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

**Good Government** preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, **good government** is impossible without good libraries. **We support good government. We support Proposition E!**

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library  
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library  
Ronald Cole, DDS  
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city's neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We're not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today's budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

**Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that's needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.**

It's a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto  
Supervisor Kevin Shelley  
Supervisor Susan Leal  
Supervisor Bill Maher  
BART Director Michael Bernick
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potro Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Samchui
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.”

The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They deposed the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
Library Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase the appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
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PROPOSITION F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?  

YES  ➤  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but cannot receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

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

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
Employment after Retirement

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman

Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

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

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" is for "FREE-LOADING"!
Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement. 

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised!

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!
Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading"
Ario Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government’s labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

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

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons

(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:

(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be... (Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

Section 8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in Section 8.511 of this charter, no person who retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall served in any elected or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an elected officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

Section 8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elected or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an elected officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

Section 8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(b)(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolition.

Section 8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(b)(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolition.

(d) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

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

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates
The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:
(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;
(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;
(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;
(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;
(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget
Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:
(a) the overall mission and goals of the department
(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities
(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity
(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity
(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments
It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains
Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

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

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

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
PROPOLENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOLENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeeman of California Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committeeeman and Past BART Board President
Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

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

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” IS FOR “GOUGING”!
Proposition “G” is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.
What a joke!
The change from a “line item” to “mission driven” budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate “missions” and “goals” should be.
About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on “research” and “studies” to “implement” a “mission statement.” With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on “mission driven” budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”.
Vote “NO” on “G”!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.
Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.
The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.
Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.
The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.
Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

**BREAK IT DOWN:** Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP:** Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in **public hearings**.

**GET IT OUT:** Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT:** Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME:** Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN:** Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting **YES on G.**

**Carole Migden**
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G.**

**Supervisor Kevin Shelley**
PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs? [YES NO]

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the “most cost-effective, safest and most convenient” BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to “divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes” to fund this project. “Essential City programs” are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “H” Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

 Supervisor Carole Migden
 Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
 Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it's written so you'll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H's supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO's planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What's needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country's largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board's duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp's argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can't afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

 Supervisor Carole Migden
 Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
 Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Doris Ward, Assessor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.
But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We’ve paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.
We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.
That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward  
Supervisor Carole Migden  
Supervisor Bill Maher  
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman  
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman  
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education  
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board  
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus  
California Democratic Party  
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service. Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtclaw, President,  
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters  
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,  
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100-400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco's transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city's history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

**SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!**
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user's nightmare!

**SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!**
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city's General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don't allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!**
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

---

**NO ON PROP. H**
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh's third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh's solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh's early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

**THREE STRIKES: YOU'RE OUT!**
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn't deserve your support and shouldn't even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn't have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp's BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It's motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Aihauto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

**Jack Davis**

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco's greatest step for public transportation in the city's history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

**VOTE NO ON H!**
If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

**VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!**

**George S. Bacigalupi, CPA**
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half-baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Curriers, Union, Local No. 36
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's
the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving
Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast,
convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a
mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San
Francisco and the Bay Area. I's plan brings BART directly under
the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the
largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes
an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop.
I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50
feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO —
VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN
INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport,
forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of
public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.
Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the
Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals
— just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO's
brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage
check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND
CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST
ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND
“NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Bianche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Moranietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weaver
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catana
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers and baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

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

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airborne terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

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

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.

THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
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PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It's the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

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

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “P” is not the answer. With Proposition 1, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “P” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
- All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
- San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airpot use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevhero
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part: “WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage. WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction was approximately $5 million. WHEREAS, the “BART trace” is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985... “RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport.”

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!
Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Hrelly, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It's vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be throttled onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport's $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART's own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let's be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won't improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!

Whether you're a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn't been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don't let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let's move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural "trace" already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it's time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport. We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO. That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION II!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hannson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hsieh's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right.

VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catchup measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makesCENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!
Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former "tightwad Supervisor," is no spendthrift. He's for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.
Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.
Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.
And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Ahbolten, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it's the right thing for San Franciscans.
I've been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don't always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it's about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years.

- BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.
  - The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
  - The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
  - Speak with transit officials at all major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition H’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue. VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cric
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City’s Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restauranteur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of
Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don’t fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!

VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H if you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired), S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the "most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location." Proposition I requires building the BART station in "the airport terminal area" — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.

• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.

• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.

• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco's Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition "I" would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10–16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.

• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.

• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.

• The $100–$400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.

• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.

• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100–$400 million ($300–$1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport? If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.
Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 - $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

* If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 - $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

* If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!

* If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carol Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 - $500 million — but they haven't figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. The fact is, they've mentioned several "potential" sources of funding, but it's ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren't owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Franciscans.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won't cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn't the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
PROPOSITION J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  

YES ▶ NO ▶

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

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

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

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.
This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.
Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.
Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.
San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.
Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.
Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.
You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandling must take place before we take action to protect people?
Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.
Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.
Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.
I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply

Geroge Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition says we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST proposition J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises? Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

San Francisco Green Party

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state!

Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.

Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.

You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far. Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(PROHIBITING LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

It be ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on anyone’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiterers or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card.

Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine.

Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction.

The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or an infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(3) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

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

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

**June 1, 2, and 3**

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROponent’S argument in Favor of Proposition K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

Rebuttal to Proponent’S Argument in Favor of Proposition K

No, we don’t have to “approve the idea of city funding — we voters want to approve specific housing developments.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the right to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee woman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee man
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright

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

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith  Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith  Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner  Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri  Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody's tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan  Mayor
Sue Bierman  Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw  Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansener  President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K
San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Bride
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsum Digidan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Hefler
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice L. Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

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

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects.

The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 5,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals and my friends.

Dolphin  Seal  Shark  Fish  Elephant  Owl  Fox  Cat

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

I love animals. They are our friends.

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and artwork composed by Masterlips Popress, Sutters.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

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

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

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

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

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing address to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing aide on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side? Your return address:

______________________________

______________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 156
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94112-4881

Place 3rd stamp here
Post Office will not deliver mail without postage
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco,
California
Permit No. 2750

CAR-RT SORT

Ballot Type
Democratic Party
Precincts Applicable

413
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District
3001 through 3944

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number

City
State Zip Code

Check below, if it is true for you:
☐ I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.
☐ My NEW address is printed below.
(Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941

Zip Code

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version. I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish,Chinese.

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

The Date You Signed

Your Day Time Phone Number
Your Evening Phone Number

to contact you if there is a problem with your application.
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr) Your Signature

Print Your First Name

Print Your Last Name

Print the Address Where You Live

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

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

--- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct: Clerk: Inspector: 


Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.¹ Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.
1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

¹ Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

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

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

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a "P" then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
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The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
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National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
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The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries (“The Way It Is Now,” “the Proposal,” “A ‘Yes’ Vote Means,” and “A ‘No’ Vote Means”) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

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

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

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

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

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don't know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don't use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

Step 1
Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

Step 2
Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红色之上。

Step 3
Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perfone con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

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

第四步
投票之后，把选票取出，沿虚线沿起选票交给选务站监票员。

Step 4
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votacion.
Dear San Francisco Republican,

We are fortunate to have this opportunity to write to you. We feel that in San Francisco, if you've made the choice to register Republican, you are committed to principles that, while not popular among many of your neighbors or most of your government officials, are nonetheless very important to you.

The San Francisco Republican Party wants to thank you for your resolve and continued support for what you know is right. We also want to let you know that you are not alone. We are very proud of the more than 70,000 registered San Francisco Republicans -- perhaps the most important minority voting-bloc in the City.

Proof of our influence can be seen in our City government. More than 40 of San Francisco’s commissioners are Republicans. San Francisco judges appointed by Republican governors have, with very few exceptions, been returned to the bench by City voters. We have a strong representative for Republican ideals on the Board of Supervisors. Everyday we are making more progress.

We want you to know that the SF/Republican Party has been very active over the last year-and-a-half since the implementation of "Plan 2000," our eight-year strategy for the rebuilding of the SF/Republican Party and electing Republicans to state offices by the year 2000.

The SF/Republican Party has also been influential over the past six years in fighting for tenant management in public housing (a concept often associated with former HUD Secretary Jack Kemp), for restructuring City government, and for ensuring safer streets and neighborhoods. One recent sign of our successes is the placing of the "Full Force Charter Amendment" on the June ballot by the Board of Supervisors. The "Full Force Charter Amendment" had its genesis in the monthly San Francisco Republican County Central Committee meetings.

In the last several months, Republican leaders like Republican National Committee Chairman Haley Barbour, Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole, and former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney have all made stops in San Francisco, not to raise money, but to have a chance to talk with and listen to San Francisco Republican volunteers.

You can learn more about what your party organization is doing by subscribing to our monthly newsletter. In it you will read about our efforts on your behalf. You'll also read detailed accounts of our projects and successes, as well as learn of our upcoming events. To become a subscriber, please return the form below. The $35 cost will be used exclusively for the production and mailing of our newsletter.

Sincerely,
Arthur Bruzzone,
Chairman, SF/Republican Party

Please send me the San Francisco Republican Party newsletter. Enclosed is my check for $35.00.

NAME: ____________________________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________________________

CITY/STATE/ZIP: ____________________________________________

DAY PHONE #: ______________________ EVE PHONE #: ______________________

Please return this form to: San Francisco Republican Party; 540 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor; San Francisco, CA 94102.

For more information about the SF/Republican Party call (415) 255-7668.

Printing of this letter was paid for by the San Francisco Republican Party; 540 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor; San Francisco, CA 94102. Contributions to the San Francisco Republican Party are not deductible as charitable contributions for federal income tax purposes. I.D. #8936095, John Stilzine, Treasurer.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 421
REPUBLICAN PARTY
8th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word “YES” or “NO.”

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

州長
GOBERNADOR
Governor

LOUIS D'ARRIGO
Farmer/Contractor
Granjero/Contratista 务農者／承包商

JIM HART

RON K. UNZ
High-Technology Entrepreneur/Businessman
Empresario de alta tecnología/Hombre de negocios 高科技創業者／商人

PETE WILSON
Governor
Gobernador 州長

Vice州長
VICEGOBERNADOR
Lieutenant Governor

CATHIE WRIGHT
Businesswoman/State Senator
Mujer de negocios/Senadora del Estado 女商人／州參議員

STAN STATHAM
Businessman/Legislator
Hombre de negocios/Legislator 商人／立法人員
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SECRETARIO DE ESTADO
Secretary of State

BILL JONES
Legislator/Businessman/Rancher
Legisrador/Hombre de negocios/Ranchero 立法人員／商人／牧場主

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

28

CONTRALOR
Controller

JOHN MORRIS
Businessman/Financial Officer
Hombre de negocios/Funcionario financiero 商人／財務人員

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

38

TOM MC CLINTOCK
Taxpayer Advocate
Defensor del contribuyente 納稅人倡導者

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

40

TESORERO
Treasurer

MATTHEW K. FONG
Member, State Board of Equalization
Miembro, Consejo de Compensación del Estado 州平準局委員

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

48
| **PROCURADOR GENERAL**  
**Attorney General** | **Vote for One** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DANIEL E. LUNGREN</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurador General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance Commissioner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLEN J. DULAC</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propietario de empresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JACK HARDEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims Adjuster/Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajustador de reclamos/Investigador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHUCK QUACKENBUSH</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legisrador/Hombre de negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JIM CONRAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Affairs Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejecutivo para cuestiones del consumidor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JIM STEIRINGER</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director de hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WES BANNISTER</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propietario de una pequeña empresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member, Board of Equalization, District 1**  
**Vote for One**

<p>| <strong>MARK S. BENDICK</strong> | <strong>74</strong> |
| Tax Advisor        |        |
| Consejero impositivo|        |
| <strong>ROBERT ‘BOB’ STRAWN</strong> | <strong>76</strong> |
| Businessman        |        |
| Hombre de negocios  |        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Kate Squires</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John M. Brown</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William E. (Bill) Dannemeyer</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolf G. Dalichau</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative, District 8</td>
<td>Elsa C. Cheung</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator, District 8</td>
<td>Tom Spinosa</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judy Lea</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>PHILIP LOUIS WING</td>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Consultant, Asesor informático</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>BARBARA B. KILEY</td>
<td>Member, County Central Committee, District 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Executive, Ejecutivo corporativo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>JUN RETSU HATOKUYAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>HAROLD M. HOOGASIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>JIM GILLERAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRISTINA MACK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>DENNIS J. MACK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant, Contador, 會計師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>ALBERT C. CHANG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>ELSA C. CHEUNG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Businesswoman, Mujer de negocios, 女商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>GEORGE VAUX CRESSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Owner, Propietario de una pequeña empresa, 小商業業主</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>MIKE SALARNO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fireman, Bombero, 消防員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>JOHN SIDLINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Publications Director, Director de publicaciones políticas, 政治刊物主任</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>KEVIN J. SULLIVAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Manager, Gerente de comercialización, 市場推廣經理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DANA WALSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Owner, Propietario de una pequeña empresa, 小商業業主</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>CHARLES J. WONG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>BRYANT L. WONG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development Consultant, Asesor de desarrollo económico, 基礎發展顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>MANUEL A. ROSALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular, 立委</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>MILDRED &quot;MILLIE&quot; DANCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flight Attendant-Entrepreneur, Assistent de vuelo - Empresaria, 飛航服務員－創業者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman, Hombre de negocios, 商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sample Ballot

**Consolidated Primary Election, June 7, 1994**  
**City and County of San Francisco**

## Nonpartisan Ballot  
**Balota Apartidaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote by Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>DELAINE EASTIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEWIS S. KEIZER</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERRY L. MARTIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILBERT SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAL RICE</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN G. DIMARCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Assessor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote by Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Public Defender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote by Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Earthquake Relief and Seismic Retrofit Bond Act of 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Safe Schools Act of 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1994. To renew California's economic vitality and to regain our state's high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state's economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994

1A

159 SI 160 NO
赞成 反对
ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERRORREMOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B

163 SI 164 NO
赞成 反对
ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C

169 SI 170 NO
赞成 反对
ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando moderna tecnología de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

FaN
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters' credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons' access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反對

CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 - 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

175

191 SI 贊成
192 NO 反對

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

176

198 SI 贊成
199 NO 反對

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD, ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazará las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

177
9E

**NONPARTISAN BALLOT**
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATELES

EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反对

ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de inmundizar daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反对

LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTORICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

224 SI 贊成
225 NO 反对

FAVOR DEL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES.

2178

179

180

FaN
**SAMPLE BALLOT**  
**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**  
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

237 SI 賛成
238 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para aclarar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesitadas o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

244 SI 賛成
245 NO 反對
¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadora, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

251 SI 賛成
252 NO 反對
¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

256 SI 賛成
257 NO 反對
¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
| **E** | Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week? | YES 263 | NO 264 |
| **F** | Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? | YES 270 | NO 271 |
| **G** | Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process? | YES 274 | NO 275 |
| **H** | Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs? | YES 278 | NO 279 |
| **I** | Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government? | YES 283 | NO 284 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>propuesta</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Contra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan empleos o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

J Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM? YES 289  NO 290

K Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled? YES 295  NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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289 SI 赞成
Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazanean o se queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

290 NO 反对

295 SI 赞成
Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

296 NO 反对

FIN DE LA BALOTA

票终
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INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfóre la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título “Balota para un dandidato no listado.”

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfóre la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras “Sí” o “NO.”

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知：

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你撕破、損壞或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, VUELVAS A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING, TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.
The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES
On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.
The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.
As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.
We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.
My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Mailliard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alloto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hililites St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumashero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Levin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Cuan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Morl, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are voluntered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wal Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardenside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palamos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodls, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.
BACKGROUND

What Is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today's dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the City’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propotions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a "Yes" vote means, and what a "No" vote means. There is a statement by the City's Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Proponent’s" and "Opponent’s" Arguments

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

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

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

"Proponent’s Argument"

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

"Opponent’s Argument"

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

Rebuttal Arguments

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

Paid Arguments

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

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

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

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

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

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

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

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

- Bond redemption $95,000,000
- Bond interest 56,356,250
- Debt service requirement 152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
School Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings....”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.
- Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

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

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it's the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
School Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco's most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting YES on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote YES on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid's future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee  
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children's educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden  
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown  
Sheriff Michael Hennessey  
District Attorney Arlo Smith  
Assessor Doris Ward  
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City's economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children's education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa
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PAYED ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscans community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Eusteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.

It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Franciscans do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!**

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

**Taxpayers deserve more accountability! PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!**

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

*Eric Andresen, Director*

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for "door rehabilitation." In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It's not the doors that need rehabilitating! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

*Tim Carrico*

President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children's Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O'Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as "temporary" and further alleges that their condition is "critical". THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

*Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O'Connell HS Parent*

*Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor's Mission Task Force*

*Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O'Connell HS Parent*

*Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident*

*Ron Nolfin, Mission Resident*

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It's time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

*Merrier Turner Lightner*

Commissioner

San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREBY FOR THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000, for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

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

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

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

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

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

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

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION

PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilean Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman

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

“LEASE FINANCING” EQUALS “MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY”!!!
Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.
The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.
Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.
Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE “CREATIVE” CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.
Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a “pay as you go” basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.
Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.
Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results. Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B. Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.

Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

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

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

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

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WASTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

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

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco's public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and "lease financing" plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco's current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren't prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

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

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

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

(b) For the purpose of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol? YES △ NO △

Analysis by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROPONEENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes
San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.
Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city's violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.
We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.
Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.
Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.
Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.
Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety. None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.
Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.
This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONEENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BE FooLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.
Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.
As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities: we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers. This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!

The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods. Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes. The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims

Cristine Mack
Member

Helga D’Arcy
Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. "CARPE DIEM."

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Nortin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets. Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.
Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Irene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where they needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chung
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. VanderVeld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote "Yes" on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it's full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department’s budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

Vote No on Proposition D.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narc busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL

(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.

(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.

(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.

(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, when at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users’ preferences as to the facility’s operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection. Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, as adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (l) aggregate City appropriations shall not include grants donated to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (2) library diversionary appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
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PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "E"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How "E" Got on the Ballot
On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
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PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets. Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:

• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government. It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million. In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition. If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches - which used to be open 55 hours per week - are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco's Public Libraries

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don't have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children—a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don't pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It's just that simple. Let's not take chances with our kids futures. Let's guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E—for our kids and for San Francisco's future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women's Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sebene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children's Council of San Francisco

San Francisco's branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: it guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches—not inaccessible, understaffed "reading centers" but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives—in every neighborhood—to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovender, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Papper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steinman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:

Ed Bransten  
Raye Richardson  
Dale Carlson  
Jean Kalil  
Edward Callanan  
Steve Coulier  
Marjorie Stern  
Mary Louise Stong  
Virginia Gee  
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick  
Rudy Mellone  
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus  
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network  
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee  
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network  
Rod Rodrigues  
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together  
Tatiana Lorbert  
Gerda Fiske  
Jeremiah Sullivan  
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident's Organization  
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system. Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventrecca  
Budget and Policy Analyst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth. Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go? As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails. Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system. Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is. Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases. Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E. San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours. These branches are an important tool in educating our youth. Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of "direct democracy." Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Reid Estate
Angela Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramions
Theodore Seton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Dorothy Buck Jones
Jim Haus
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pucuraru
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulgigan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
   Jeanna Haney
   Marie Plazewski
   Rev. Arnold Townsend
   Peter Gabel
   Vivian Wiley
   Alexa Smith
   Karen Fitzgerald
   Patrick Fitzgerald
   Eddie Chin
   Lulu Carter
   Leslie Katz
   Matthew Rothschild
   Natalie Berg
   Caitlin Carlin
   Claire Zvanski
   Maria Martinez
   Mike Boxia
   Mary Johnson
   Elaine Collins-McBride
   Ronald Colthirst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dohelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlotta del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynne, SF Board of Education
Maria Moner, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Tang, SF Community College Board
Rodel Radis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits!

Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lagaras, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
Lee Ann Hanna Prifki, President, Diamond Hgts Community Asn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louis Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Azawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchay
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn't have as many books, and librarians were banished.

"We want to go to the library!" the children cried. "Not today," replied the unhappy parents. "The library isn't open in the afternoon anymore."

The people protested, "This isn't fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn." The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

"No way," the king proclaimed. "I'll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I'll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I'll stop planting flowers in the park."

This made the children very sad. "Why is the king so mean?" they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set-asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail.

Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Quentin L. Kopp
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PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
Employment after Retirement

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee woman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
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Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!

Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised!

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!

Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!

Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.
Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.
Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.
Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.
Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.583-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.
The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.583-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION F (Continued)

made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment. 
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program.

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs.

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate.

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay.

(e) Such other information as the Mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable:

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

(a) the overall mission and goals of the department

(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals

(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department

(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities

(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity

(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its mission, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over a three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall henceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

a) the overall mission and goals of the department
b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities
e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity
f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity
h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thereupon be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City's current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public's needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to "reinvent" government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a "Mission Driven Budget" is lifted directly from the book *Reinventing Government*, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — "Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations").

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand that Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — "rule-driven" San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their "Boodle Board" of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

---

VOTE "NO" ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeeman of California Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committeeman and Past BART Board President
Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” IS FOR “GOUGING”!

Proposition “G” is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control. What a joke!

The change from a “line item” to “mission driven” budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate “missions” and “goals” should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on “research” and “studies” to “implement” a “mission statement.” With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on “mission driven” budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”.

Vote “NO” on “G”!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

**BREAK IT DOWN**: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP**: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT**: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT**: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME**: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN**: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

**Carole Migden**
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

**Supervisor Kevin Shelley**

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Airpor BART Station

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station somewhere else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors’ resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers.

Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.
San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.
But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We've paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city's general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.
We're sick of politicians saying, "Trust me!" With Proposition H we don't have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.
That's a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don't need to raise taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10-16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whiskers passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100-$400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100-$400 million ($300-$1,300 per family), or cut Muni service. Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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**PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H**

**Vote YES on Proposition H!**

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT'S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs. Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.**

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO  
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350  
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141  
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,  
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)  
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!

San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!

A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doom-sayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION 1!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!

If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Airport BART Station

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By proposing a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O'Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self-serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Koubra
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corbin
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriets, Union, Local No. 36
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO —
VOTE YES ON PROP. I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Jana New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as “The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance.”

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops and the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission’s determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby and shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SP’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “P” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “P” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
- All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
- San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “P.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
 Supervisor Sue Bierman
 Supervisor Carole Migden
 Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Golan
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part: "WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

---

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don't be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City's general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City's general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City's general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felter, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I's opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don't be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!

Michael Strusnky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP$ITION I

It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation as a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hsieh's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!
Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.

Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Abbottin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grandchild, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years.
BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport.
Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

• The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
• The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
• Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!

Carlos del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Committee
Margaret Cruz

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.
VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restauranteur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!
Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!
As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!
VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Rater, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure rapid transit — BART — goes directly into the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lennmon
Nada I. Lennmon
Honor Bultley
Jonathan Bultley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART into the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART into the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high-speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
• The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?!! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.
Vote NO on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 - $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- **If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 - $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- **If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!
- **If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lula Carter
Eddie Chin
Sallie Curtain
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 - $500 million — but they haven't figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they've mentioned several "potential" sources of funding, but it's ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren't owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. **Prop. I isn't the best choice to get BART to the airport**, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. **Vote NO on Proposition I.**

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY
FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger
finance charges for BART.

2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already
determined that MTC will not provide federal or state
transit funds for the Prop. I station.

3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds avail-
able to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain
and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully
funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers
each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
Sun Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation
Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
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PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES [ ]

NO [ ]

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.
The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City's multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won't make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn't prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can't do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won't have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM's really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM's? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a "safety" zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM's. The Mayor's law seeks to play on the public's emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM's. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let's not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let's ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM's while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. **Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.**

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM's.

**Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit.** Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

**Proposition J will not make us any safer.** It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM's is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 30 feet or more. The police can't help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn't be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply

George Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.

Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.

You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far. Before you believe the politicians' claims that it "won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens," read Proposition J and decide for yourself. This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially "off-limits" for ordinary citizens. New "no lingering" zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to "linger" in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that "can be conducted" outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of "lingering" to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely "lingering" or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to "move along." Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of "no lingering" zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be "in your face" at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not. Vote "NO" on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(PROHIBITING LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121

THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public's safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit anyone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $30 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

**June 1, 2, and 3**

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance. In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "K"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How "K" Got on the Ballot
On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROPOsENT’S ARGUMEN'T IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Cotheridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelssohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOsENT’S ARGUMEN'T IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeepeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

*Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check.* Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

*Vote NO on Proposition K.*

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committee of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody's tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don't be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor's Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bonsen
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K
San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.
San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.
Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.
The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.
San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.
Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsum Digidigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Owl

I love animals

That are our friends

Find yourself a best friend.
We're open 7 days a week,
12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Supt. of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, **take this page with you to the polls.** Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your **Polling Place** is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

---

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?
Your return address:

---

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you. The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION** - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election, **SIGN** this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

**Check one below:**

- Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

**Check below, if it is true for you:**

- I have moved since the last time I registered to vote. My NEW address is printed below. (Residence address only.)
- I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- All voters receive the English version. I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish, Chinese

**Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.**

- You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

- To contact you if there is a problem with your application:

**Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT**

**The Date You Signed**

**Your Day Time Phone Number**

**Your Evening Phone Number**
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q. WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
### Polling Place / Poll Worker Honor Roll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple Sites
- San Francisco Unified Schools
- Multiple Poll Workers
- Walden House

---

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

---

### Equal Civic Duty Opportunity - Sign Up Today

**Registrar of Voters - Poll Worker Application**

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)**

Sign Here

Your Signature

**Print Your First Name**

**Ml**

**Print Your Last Name**

**Print the Address Where You Live**

**Zip Code**

**Day Phone**

---

**Eve. Phone**

---

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:

I HAVE a car: [Please Check]

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

---

**Assigned Precinct:**

**Home Precinct:**

**Affidavit Number:**

**Clerk:**

**Inspector:**

**E.O. Bk.**

**Code**

**Reg. Attached**

**Init.'l**

---

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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### PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .................. 11-30
2. the location of your **polling place**; ........................................ (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an **Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent **absentee voter status**; .................. back cover
4. **Your rights as a voter**; .......................................................... 8
5. information for **disabled voters**; ............................................. 5
6. **statements from candidates** who are running for local office; ............... 32-33
7. **information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................. 37-127
8. **definitions of words** you need to know; and ........................................ 36
9. a **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting. .................. inside back cover
Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.¹ Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong  
Registrar of Voters

¹ Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters' office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

---

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

____ Lost use of one or more limbs;
____ Lost use of both hands;
____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may "fax" your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

"Cleaning" your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE

Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A ‘Yes’ Vote Means," and "A ‘No’ Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
   • Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

   OR

   • Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请用双手将票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con los dos cabezitas rojas.

第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfora con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把带孔之选票针，由小孔垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之后，把选票取出，
沿虚线把选票交给选举站监督员。

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votacion.
San Francisco Republican Party

Dear San Francisco Republican,

We are fortunate to have this opportunity to write to you. We feel that in San Francisco, if you've made the choice to register Republican, you are committed to principles that, while not popular among many of your neighbors or most of your government officials, are nonetheless very important to you.

The San Francisco Republican Party wants to thank you for your resolve and continued support for what you know is right. We also want to let you know that you are not alone. We are very proud of the more than 70,000 registered San Francisco Republicans -- perhaps the most important minority voting-bloc in the City.

Proof of our influence can be seen in our City government. More than 40 of San Francisco's commissioners are Republicans. San Francisco judges appointed by Republican governors have, with very few exceptions, been returned to the bench by City voters. We have a strong representative for Republican ideals on the Board of Supervisors. Everyday we are making more progress.

We want you to know that the SF/Republican Party has been very active over the last year-and-a-half since the implementation of "Plan 2000," our eight-year strategy for the rebuilding of the SF/Republican Party and electing Republicans to state offices by the year 2000.

The SF/Republican Party has also been influential over the past six years in fighting for tenant management in public housing (a concept often associated with former HUD Secretary Jack Kemp), for restructuring City government, and for ensuring safer streets and neighborhoods. One recent sign of our successes is the placing of the 'Full Force Charter Amendment' on the June ballot by the Board of Supervisors. The "Full Force Charter Amendment" had its genesis in the monthly San Francisco Republican County Central Committee meetings.

In the last several months, Republican leaders like Republican National Committee Chairman Haley Barbour, Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole, and former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney have all made stops in San Francisco, not to raise money, but to have a chance to talk with and listen to San Francisco Republican volunteers.

You can learn more about what your party organization is doing by subscribing to our monthly newsletter. In it you will read about our efforts on your behalf. You'll also read detailed accounts of our projects and successes, as well as learn of our upcoming events. To become a subscriber, please return the form below. The $35 cost will be used exclusively for the production and mailing of our newsletter.

Sincerely,

Arthur Bruzzone,
Chairman, SF/Republican Party

Please send me the San Francisco Republican Party newsletter. Enclosed is my check for $35.00.

NAME: ________________________________________________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________________________________________

CITY/STATE/ZIP: ______________________________________________________

DAY PHONE #: ___________________________ EVE PHONE #: __________________

Please return this form to: San Francisco Republican Party; 540 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor; San Francisco, CA 94102.

For more information about the SF/Republican Party call (415) 255-7668.

Printing of this letter was paid for by the San Francisco Republican Party; 540 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor; San Francisco, CA 94102. Contributions to the San Francisco Republican Party are not deductible as charitable contributions for federal income tax purposes. I.D.#89-06085, John Sidlin, Treasurer.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 422
REPUBLICAN PARTY
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文说明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOUIS D’ARRIGO</strong>&lt;br&gt;Farmers/Contractor&lt;br&gt;Granjero/Contratista 务農者／承包商</td>
<td>2 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JIM HART</strong></td>
<td>4 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RON K. UNZ</strong>&lt;br&gt;High-Technology Entrepreneur/Businessman&lt;br&gt;Empresario de alta tecnología/Hombre de negocios 高科技創業者／商人</td>
<td>6 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PETE WILSON</strong>&lt;br&gt;Governor&lt;br&gt;Gobernador 州長</td>
<td>8 ➡️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lieutenant Governor</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CATHIE WRIGHT</strong>&lt;br&gt;Businesswoman/State Senator&lt;br&gt;Mujer de negocios/Senadora del Estado 女商人／州議員</td>
<td>18 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAN STATHAM</strong>&lt;br&gt;Businessman/Legislator&lt;br&gt;Hombre de negocios/Legisrador 商人／立法人員</td>
<td>20 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>BILL JONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislator/Businessman/Rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislador/Hombre de negocios/Ranchero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>JOHN MORRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman/Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de negocios/Funcionario financiero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MATTHEW K. FONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Consejo de Compensación del Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>Daniel E. Lungren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>Glen J. Dulac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims Adjuster/Investigator</td>
<td>Jack Harden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Businessman</td>
<td>Chuck Quackenbush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Affairs Executive</td>
<td>Jim Conran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Director</td>
<td>Jim Stieringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td>Wes Bannister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Advisor</td>
<td>Mark S. Bendick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Robert 'Bob' Strawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

### CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENATOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Senator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KATE SQUIRES</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propietaria de empresa 商業東主</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOHN M. BROWN</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendedor 推銷員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLIAM E. (BILL) DANNEMEYER</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre de negocios 商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOLF G. DALICHAU</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panadero 麵包師傅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICHAEL HUFFINGTON</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Businessman, Congressman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre de negocios independiente, Congresista 獨立法商會、國會議員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Representative, District 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BILL QURAISHI</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingeniero asesor 顧問工程師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBORAH WILDER</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Senator, District 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOM SPINOSA</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Law Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigador de leyes constitucionales 憲法顧問</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDY LEA</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agente de bienes raíces 實業經紀</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 12</td>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP LOUIS WING</td>
<td>PHILIP LOUIS WING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Consultant</td>
<td>Asesor informático</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee, District 12</td>
<td>Member, County Central Committee, District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA B. KILEY</td>
<td>BARBARA B. KILEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Executive / Ejecutivo corporativo / 公司高级人员</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN RETSU HATOHAMA</td>
<td>JUN RETSU HATOHAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAROLD M. HOOGASIAN</td>
<td>HAROLD M. HOOGASIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM GILLERAN</td>
<td>JIM GILLERAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISTINA MACK</td>
<td>CRISTINA MACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant / Contador / 會計師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. CHANG</td>
<td>ALBERT C. CHANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSA C. CHEUNG</td>
<td>ELSA C. CHEUNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesswoman / Mujer de negocios / 女商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE VAUX CRESCON</td>
<td>GEORGE VAUX CRESCON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner / Propietario de una pequeña empresa / 小商東主</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE SALARNO</td>
<td>MIKE SALARNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman / Bombero / 消防员</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SIDLINE</td>
<td>JOHN SIDLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Publications Director / Director de publicaciones políticas / 政治刊物主任</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN J. SULLIVAN</td>
<td>KEVIN J. SULLIVAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Manager / Gerente de comercialización / 市场推广经理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANA WALSH</td>
<td>DANA WALSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner / Propietario de una pequeña empresa / 小商東主</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES J. WONG</td>
<td>CHARLES J. WONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYANT L. WONG</td>
<td>BRYANT L. WONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Consultant / Asesor de desarrollo económico / 綏渉發展顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUEL A. ROSALES</td>
<td>MANUEL A. ROSALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILDRED &quot;MILLIE&quot; DANCH</td>
<td>MILDRED &quot;MILLIE&quot; DANCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Attendant-Entrepreneur / Asistente de vuelo - Empresaria / 機艙服務員 - 創業者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de negocios / 商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 12</td>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP LOUIS WING</td>
<td>PHILIP LOUIS WING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Consultant</td>
<td>Asesor informático</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee, District 12</td>
<td>Member, County Central Committee, District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA B. KILEY</td>
<td>BARBARA B. KILEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Executive / Ejecutivo corporativo / 公司高级人员</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN RETSU HATOHAMA</td>
<td>JUN RETSU HATOHAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAROLD M. HOOGASIAN</td>
<td>HAROLD M. HOOGASIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM GILLERAN</td>
<td>JIM GILLERAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISTINA MACK</td>
<td>CRISTINA MACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant / Contador / 會計師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. CHANG</td>
<td>ALBERT C. CHANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSA C. CHEUNG</td>
<td>ELSA C. CHEUNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesswoman / Mujer de negocios / 女商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE VAUX CRESCON</td>
<td>GEORGE VAUX CRESCON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner / Propietario de una pequeña empresa / 小商東主</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE SALARNO</td>
<td>MIKE SALARNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman / Bombero / 消防员</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SIDLINE</td>
<td>JOHN SIDLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Publications Director / Director de publicaciones políticas / 政治刊物主任</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN J. SULLIVAN</td>
<td>KEVIN J. SULLIVAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Manager / Gerente de comercialización / 市场推广经理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANA WALSH</td>
<td>DANA WALSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner / Propietario de una pequeña empresa / 小商東主</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES J. WONG</td>
<td>CHARLES J. WONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYANT L. WONG</td>
<td>BRYANT L. WONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Consultant / Asesor de desarrollo económico / 綏渉發展顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUEL A. ROSALES</td>
<td>MANUEL A. ROSALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular / 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILDRED &quot;MILLIE&quot; DANCH</td>
<td>MILDRED &quot;MILLIE&quot; DANCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Attendant-Entrepreneur / Asistente de vuelo - Empresaria / 機艙服務員 - 創業者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de negocios / 商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
BALOTA APARTIDARIA
無黨派選票

州教育廳長
SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

DELAINE EASTIN
Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleísta / 教師－女議員

DAVID L. KILBER

CAROL S. KOPPEL
Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官

LEWIS S. KEIZER
Educator / Educador / 教育工作者

PERRY L. MARTIN
Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師

FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE
Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師

JOSEPH D. CARRABINO
Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者－管理顧問

WILBERT SMITH
Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 商人，教育工作者

ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART
Teacher / Maestro / 教師

HAL RICE
High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 高中教師

GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN
Teacher/School Trustee / Maestra/Síndico escolar / 教師／校董

MAUREEN G. DIMARCO
Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育內閣秘書

atLng

估稅官
ASESOR
Assessor

DORIS M. WARD
Assessor / Asesor 估稅官

公共辯護律師
DEFENSOR PUBLICO
Public Defender

JEFF BROWN
Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco 公共辯護律師
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

YES 159  NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

YES 163  NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

YES 169  NO 170
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDado DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1A. ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SÍSMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B. ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1992 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C. ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza la emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crean trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 135 ciudades universitarias incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

FuN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters' credit.</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反对
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $80 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 - 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

191 SI 贊成
192 NO 反对
IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

198 SI 贊成
199 NO 反对
EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改

物業稅免除，低收入住房，立法性憲法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造，擴建，移去，或改
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
SAMPLE BALLOT
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MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

211 SI 贏成
EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. EMIENIDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Emiende la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según lo define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

178

212 NO 反對

218 SI 贏成
ASESINATO: CASTIGO. EMIENIDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asestado de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infirir daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumento desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

179

219 NO 反對

224 SI 贏成
LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTORICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

180

225 NO 反對
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A  SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

YES 237  
NO 238  

B  Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

YES 244  
NO 245  

C  Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES 251  
NO 252  

D  Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES 256  
NO 257  
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BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para con- traer una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
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E Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

F Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

G Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

H Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

I Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?
SAMPLE BALLOT
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263 SI 负成
264 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínimo especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 负成
271 NO 反对

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos pueden volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 负成
275 NO 反对

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 负成
279 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 负成
284 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
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J    Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

   YES 289
   NO 290

K    Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

   YES 295
   NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反對

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazanean o se queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

J

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反對

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

K

FIN DE LA BALOTA

票終
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INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dandiado no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha en frente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知:

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你揭過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，
請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor.
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.
As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.
We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.
My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alleoto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 830 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hiligra St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Berman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumashero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Mahler, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Levin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Morl, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender’s office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dui, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Gorgl, 135 Gardenside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cheryl A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Redel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO’S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$95,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>56,356,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$152,356,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
School Bonds

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling "temporary" bungalows at Argonne Year Round School
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City's economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: "As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs...but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

"Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...."

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O'Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O'Connell.

It's "politics as usual".

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- "Contracting out" routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it's the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can't keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather "stick it" to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say "No" to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don't believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling "temporary" bungalows at the Richmond District's Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district's John O'Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be "stuck" with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco's most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women's Resource Center has been a vital working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women's Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators' or teachers' salaries. For the sake of our children's future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco's public schools cannot prepare our city's children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings.

By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people. Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco's strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It's simple enough: The city's old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today's youth and prepare tomorrow's workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.

It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of $599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! Taxpayers deserve more accountability! PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andersen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for "door rehabilitation." In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It's not the doors that need rehabilitating!
San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children's Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O'Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as "temporary" and further alleges that their condition is "critical". THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O' Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor's Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O' Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Nordin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices. Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don't have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It's time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RESOLVING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PREScribing NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION FOR AND GOVERNING ELECTIONS IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, AND THE POLLS FOR SUCH ELECTION SHALL BE AND REMAIN OPEN DURING THE TIME REQUIRED BY SAID LAWS.

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated.

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000, for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and In such said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars, not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition: "SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semianually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B
Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"
On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases  
Alexa Smith  
Democratic Central Committee Member  
Arlo Hale Smith  
Past President BART Board  
Robert Silvestri  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Terence Faulkner  
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party  
Ramona Albright  
President Twin Peaks Council  
Andrew de la Rosa  
Democratic Central Committee Candidate  
Irene Hernandez  
Democratic Central Committee Candidate  
Max Woods  
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal checkbooks: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents' arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.

Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.

Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.

Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
C

Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER?!

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco's public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and "lease financing" plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco's current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren't prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don't let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It's our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DEscribing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof relating to the financing of the construction or acquisition of equipment.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:
(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or
(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or
(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Bierman and Hallinan.
Police Staffing

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes

San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.
Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.
None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!
Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FOOLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.
Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.
Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.
Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.
I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.
Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.
Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The "prime" responsibility of Government is to "protect" its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it's a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D'Arcy
Member
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the “FULL FORCE FUNDING” initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support “FULL FORCE FUNDING” for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geyar Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naïve and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.
Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection.

The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That’s why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it’s full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy. Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
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San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves. VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
- clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
- police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
- police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
- narcotics busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
- jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
- cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
- vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
- police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
- police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND
(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.
(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.
Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.
(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.
(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.
(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
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PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How "E" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTLAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government. It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million. In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police offers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition. If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Trigueror, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Ebert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blausin, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Ade, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steinman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Robert Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. **Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.**

Former Library Commissioners:

Edward Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. **Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.**

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open **without raising taxes.** That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — **Vote Yes on Prop E!**

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorber
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident's Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

**Vote Yes on E.**

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases. Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth. Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges VOTE YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of "direct democracy." Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we're to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco's public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City's future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city's economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990's is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zwanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bostia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baun
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacwar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlotta del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifki, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welsh
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchay
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Employment after Retirement

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City's $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. **Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.**

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

**SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPO-RARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.**

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City's high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.**

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman

Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!
Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.
Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.
What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!
But are you surprised?
This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.
Say "NO" to double-dipping!
Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.
The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.
To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.
Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.
What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?
Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs:
Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.
Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.
Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.
Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.
Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons

(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:

(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county, service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county, service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided that compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided that compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program.

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs.

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate.

(d) A schedule of positions and compensation showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay.

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 1998, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

a) the overall mission and goals of the department

b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals

c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department

d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities

e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity

f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that then separately be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2.

Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller's issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES ➡
NO ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a “line-item” budget. This “line-item” budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department’s programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City’s “line-item” budget and replace it with a “mission-driven” budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department’s performance in the year before.

The “mission-driven” budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department’s success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a “line-item” budget to a “mission-driven” budget.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Re-inventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 - “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeeman of California Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committeeeman and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” IS FOR “GOUGING”!
Proposition “G” is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.
What a joke!
The change from a “line item” to “mission driven” budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate “missions” and “goals” should be.
About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on “research” and “studies” to “implement” a “mission statement.” With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on “mission driven” budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”.
Vote “NO” on “G”!
Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terrence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.
Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.
The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.
Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.
The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.
Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

**BREAK IT DOWN:** Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP:** Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT:** Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT:** Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME:** Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN:** Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
*Peter Donohue, Ph.D.*, consulting economist
*Marc Norton*, community activist
*Joel Ventresca*, budget and policy analyst
*Calvin Welch*, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.
Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.
Reduce the waste in City Hall!
Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

*Carole Migden*
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

*Supervisor Kevin Shelley*

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “H” Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden. The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

• Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
• Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
• Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!

VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and L.A. Guadniad directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPO NENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Unlike Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rs of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system. But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We’ve paid our fair share. Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can't afford to approve any scheme that's proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that's really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won't cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won't jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don't want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport's 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn't leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn't cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There's been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can't afford to raise taxes or raid the City's general fund to pay for it if there's a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city's general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition "H" assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10-16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn't a BART extension to the terminal area be the "most cost-effective and convenient"?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 - $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 - $400 million ($300 - $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!
Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. H will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco's transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city's history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user's nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city's General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don't allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION 1!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh's third strike.
Strike one: Hsieh's solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.
Strike two: Hsieh's early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.
Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU'RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn't deserve your support and shouldn't even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn't have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp's BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It's motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.
If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco's greatest step for public transportation in the city's history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!
If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep's clothing: it's not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don't get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half-baked.

Vote No on Prop. H.

Joe O'Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. I's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.

Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP. I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO's brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. "YES" ON I AND "NO" on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly

Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Granlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

Prop H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!

Prop H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Dreifke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irina Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposi-
tion I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commission, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
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PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
- All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
- San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Argumenta printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 – $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings: less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Vanni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreur
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracanan
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part "WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage. WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million. WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985... "RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don't be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City's general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City's general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City's general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Hertlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.
Prop I's opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.
It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don't be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Maiz, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Anne Marie Convoy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It’s sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don’t want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It’s just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco’s reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!
VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hsieh’s Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let’s Do it right the first time.

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
- Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
- Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don’t be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!
Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn’t in the airport and doesn’t meet the needs of today’s business travelers? Let’s do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor

Argumenta printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I. Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH! Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Ahlboltin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchak, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fared are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years.

BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue. VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area.However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yeats
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Rater, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART INTO the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired), S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Conner, Pres.
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Vergez, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 - 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 - $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 - $400 million ($300 - $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

• Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
• More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
• Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock.
Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.
Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 - $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- **If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says that San Francisco must take "all necessary actions" to build a $300 - $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- **If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn't financially feasible!
- **If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn't as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren't cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
*Matthew Rothschild*, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
*Carole Migden*, Chair
*Lulu Carter*  
*Eddie Chin*  
*Caitlin Curtin*  
*Jeanna Haney*  
*Leslie Katz*  
*Maria Martinez*  
*Elaine Collins McBride*  
*Claire Zvanski*  
*Jim Rivaldo*  
*Norman Rolfe*

---

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 - $500 million — but they haven't figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they've mentioned several "potential" sources of funding, but it's ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren't owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won't cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. **Prop. I isn't the best choice to get BART to the airport**, and we can't afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don't have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

*Terence Faulkner*  
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

*Max Woods*  
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

---
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Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES  NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How “J” Got on the Ballot

On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
ATM Area

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City's multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won't make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn't prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can't do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won't have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM's really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM's? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a "safety" zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM's. The Mayor's law seeks to play on the public's emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM's. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let's not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let's ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J. San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM's while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM's.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM's is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can't help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn't be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
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People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply

George Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

________________________________________

The opposition say’s we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need your yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn't Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn't Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City's approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President
Itene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.
Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won't solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you're sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.
But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.
Proposition J isn't reasonable or responsible. It's extreme, unenforceable and absurd.
Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?
Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.
Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don't let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state!
Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what's next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!
Proposition J wastes precious police resources.
Laws already exist to protect ATM users.
Proposition J violates the First Amendment.
You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.
Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

• chat with a friend,
• distribute flyers,
• sip coffee,
• hail a cab,
• gather petition signatures, or
• read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a fourth time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 and not more than $1000, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

**June 1, 2, and 3**

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
**PROPOSITION K**

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance. In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

---

**Controller’s Statement on "K"**

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

---

**How “K” Got on the Ballot**

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

---

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor's Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Briggs
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco

Visit or call us today. 1200 15th Street, S.F. (415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE**
Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name | #**
- State Supt. of Public Instruction
- Assessor
- Public Defender

**LOCAL PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?
Your return address:

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA  94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

Ballot Type
Republican Party
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District
Precincts Applicable
2301 through 2612
2801 through 2816

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:

☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.

☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number

City

State

Zip Code

Check below, if it is true for you:

☐ I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.

☐ My NEW address is printed below.

(Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

9 4 1

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.

☐ All voters receive the English version.

☐ I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish_____, Chinese_____.

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

The Date You Signed

Your Day Time Phone Number

Your Evening Phone Number

To contact you if there is a problem with your application:
POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
# POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tionco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Multiple Sites | San Francisco Unified Schools | Multiple Poll Workers | Waiden House |

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

# EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

## REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)**  
\[\underline{\phantom{000}} / \underline{\phantom{00}} / \underline{\phantom{0000}}\]  
*Sign Here*  

**Print Your First Name**  
\[\underline{\phantom{0000}}\]  

**Print Your Last Name**  
\[\underline{\phantom{0000}}\]  

**Print the Address Where You Live**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  

**Zip Code**  
\[\underline{\phantom{000000}}\]  

**Day Phone**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  
**Eve. Phone**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  

I HAVE a car:  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  
(Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  

**Assigned Precinct:**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  
**Home Precinct:**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  

**Affidavit Number:**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  
**Clerk:**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  
**Inspector:**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  

**E.O. Bk.**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  
**Code**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  
**Reg. Attached**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  
**Initl.**  
\[\underline{\phantom{00000000000000000000}}\]  

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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Dear San Francisco Voters:

**YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT**

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.¹ Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

**B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)**

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

¹ Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters' office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a "Permanent Absentee Voter" you must have at least one of the following conditions:

[ ] Lost use of one or more limbs;
[ ] Lost use of both hands;
[ ] Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
[ ] Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
[ ] Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
[ ] Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says "I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER" and sign your name where it says "Your SIGNATURE."

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a "P" then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a postcard with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may "fax" your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

"Cleaning" your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
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John Odell
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The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994; OR
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE: 
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

STEP 1
Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
請把直釘之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4
After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votmatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entréguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虛線把選票交給選舉站監選員。
San Francisco Republican Party

Dear San Francisco Republican,

We are fortunate to have this opportunity to write to you. We feel that in San Francisco, if you've made the choice to register Republican, you are committed to principles that, while not popular among many of your neighbors or most of your government officials, are nonetheless very important to you.

The San Francisco Republican Party wants to thank you for your resolve and continued support for what you know is right. We also want to let you know that you are not alone. We are very proud of the more than 70,000 registered San Francisco Republicans -- perhaps the most important minority voting-bloc in the City.

Proof of our influence can be seen in our City government. More than 40 of San Francisco's commissioners are Republicans. San Francisco judges appointed by Republican governors have, with very few exceptions, been returned to the bench by City voters. We have a strong representative for Republican ideals on the Board of Supervisors. Everyday we are making more progress.

We want you to know that the SF/Republican Party has been very active over the last year-and-a-half since the implementation of "Plan 2000," our eight-year strategy for the rebuilding of the SF/Republican Party and electing Republicans to state offices by the year 2000.

The SF/Republican Party has also been influential over the past six years in fighting for tenant management in public housing (a concept often associated with former HUD Secretary Jack Kemp), for restructuring City government, and for ensuring safer streets and neighborhoods. One recent sign of our successes is the placing of the "Full Force Charter Amendment" on the June ballot by the Board of Supervisors. The "Full Force Charter Amendment" had its genesis in the monthly San Francisco Republican County Central Committee meetings.

In the last several months, Republican leaders like Republican National Committee Chairman Haley Barbour, Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole, and former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney have all made stops in San Francisco, not to raise money, but to have a chance to talk with and listen to San Francisco Republican volunteers.

You can learn more about what your party organization is doing by subscribing to our monthly newsletter. In it you will read about our efforts on your behalf. You'll also read detailed accounts of our projects and successes, as well as learn of our upcoming events. To become a subscriber, please return the form below. The $35 cost will be used exclusively for the production and mailing of our newsletter.

Sincerely,
Arthur Bruzzone,
Chairman, SF/Republican Party

--------------------------------
Please send me the San Francisco Republican Party newsletter. Enclosed is my check for $35.00.

NAME: __________________________________________

ADDRESS: _______________________________________

CITY/STATE/ZIP: __________________________________

DAY PHONE #: ___________________ EVE PHONE #: ___________________

Please return this form to: San Francisco Republican Party; 540 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor; San Francisco, CA 94102.

For more information about the SF/Republican Party call (415) 255-7668.

Printing of this letter was paid for by the San Francisco Republican Party; 540 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor; San Francisco, CA 94102. Contributions to the San Francisco Republican Party are not deductible as charitable contributions for federal income tax purposes. I.D. #8950605, John Sidline, Treasurer.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 423
REPUBLICAN PARTY
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>JIM HART</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RON K. UNZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOUIS D’ARRIGO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>STAN STATHAM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CATHIE WRIGHT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>BILL JONES</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vote for Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislator/Businessman/Rancher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislador/Hombre de negocios/Ranchero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>TOM MC CLINTOCK</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxpayer Advocate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensor del contribuyente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MATTHEW K. FONG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Consejo de Compensación del Estado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCURADOR GENERAL (Attorney General)</td>
<td>DANIEL E. LUNGREN</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS (Insurance Commissioner)</td>
<td>JACK HARDEN</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Businessman</td>
<td>CHUCK QUACKENBUSH</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM CONRAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM STIERINGER</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES BANNISTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEN J. DULAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO DE COMPENSACION, DISTRITO 1</td>
<td>ROBERT 'BOB' STRAWN</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, DISTRICT 1</td>
<td>MARK S. BENDICK</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td>JOHN M. BROWN</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM E. (BILL) DANNEMEYER</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOLF G. DALICHOW</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL HUFFINGTON</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KATE SQUIRES</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>ELSA C. CHEUNG</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito.

本區並無此職位之競選
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARC WOLIN</td>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 13</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Fair Producer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Productor de ferias laborales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>職業展覽會監製</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM T. HARPER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN MILLER</td>
<td>Mortgage Banker / Banquero de hipotecas</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>貸款銀行家</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRACE NORTON</td>
<td>Public Relations Consultant / Asesor de relaciones públicas / 公共關係顧問</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE CHUNG</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD A. CASPER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOANNE &quot;JODY&quot; STEVENS</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFREY WIEGAND</td>
<td>Environmental Technologies Developer / Desarrollador de tecnologías ambientales / 環保技術開發者</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>Entrepreneur-Transit Engineer / Empresario - Ingeniero de tránsito / 創業者－交通工程師</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE B. VANDERVELD</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent / Titular nombrado / 委任現任者</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR BRUZZONE</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER L. BOWMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWIN E. &quot;TED&quot; TURKELL</td>
<td>Certificado interior Designer / Diseñador licenciado de interiores / 認證室內設計師</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON</td>
<td>Retired College Professor / Profesor universitario jubilado / 退休大學教授</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NONPARTISAN BALLOT  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **州教育廳長**  
SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction |
| **DAVID L. KILBER**  
Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官 |
| **CAROL S. KOPPEL**  
Educator / Educador / 教育工作者 |
| **LEWIS S. KEIZER**  
Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師 |
| **PERRY L. MARTIN**  
Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師 |
| **FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE**  
Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者－管理顧問 |
| **WILBERT SMITH**  
Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 商人．教育工作者 |
| **JOSEPH D. CARRABINO**  
Teacher / Maestro / 教師 |
| **HAL RICE**  
High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 中高教師 |
| **GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN**  
Teacher/School Trustee / Maestra/Síndico escolar / 教師／校董 |
| **MAUREEN G. DIMARCO**  
Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育內閣秘書 |
| **DELAINE EASTIN**  
Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleísta / 教師一參議員 |

---

| CITY AND COUNTY |

| **估税官**  
ASESOR  
Assessor |
| **DORIS M. WARD**  
Assessor / Asesor 估税官 |

| **公共辯護律師**  
DEFENSOR PUBLICO  
Public Defender |
| **JEFF BROWN**  
Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco  
Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco 公共辯護律師 |
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program. YES 159
NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement. YES 163
NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead. YES 169
NO 170
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994</th>
<th>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>159 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>160 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.</td>
<td><strong>F7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>163 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>164 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.</td>
<td><strong>1994年安全學校法案，此法案規定發行一千億美元($1,000,000,000)的公債，提供經費以建置安全改進學校，並授權分撥一九五三年州校舍補助公債法案的公債金與利息收入用於目前學校的建築或改進。</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>169 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>170 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>1C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.</td>
<td><strong>1994六月高等教育設施公債法案，旨在重振加州的教育生命力和提高本州的高等教育水平。此法案授权发行九亿美元($900,000,000)用于加强、改善和新建高等学院和大学。这些项目将创造就业机会并为成人和学生提供职业培训的机会。这些高等学院和大学将提供职业培训的机会，培训在逃学生参加职业竞赛和帮助学生参加竞赛的另一途径。通过改善教室和提供现代化的教育技术，这些计划将改善公立高等教育的环境。该法案授权在136所公立学院的各项目计划中，包括但不限于：防震和其他公共安全改善计划；更新实验室以适应科技发展；为教育技术改造的教室和图书馆；扩建教室和图书馆。所有通过公债所得的款项和产生的收入，均不会用于日常行政开支。</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons' access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>OPONencia</th>
<th>TÍTULO</th>
<th>DESCRIPCIÓN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.</td>
<td>Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $80 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 - 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.</td>
<td>Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $80 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 - 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.</td>
<td>Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.</td>
<td>Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA Propiedad. Acceso DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.</td>
<td>Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA Propiedad. Acceso DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.</td>
<td>Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT.
LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT.
Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVA-
TION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
### SAMPLE BALLOT
**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>178 SI</td>
<td>EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>178 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>179 SI</td>
<td>ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infingirle daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>179 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>180 SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVÍSTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>180 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**  
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

### 10E  
**NONPARTISAN BALLOT**  
**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**  
**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Proposition Title</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>To improve the School District of San Francisco. For the issuance of bonds of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction, and reconstruction of the installations of the School District Unified of San Francisco, the modifications to the installations, the construction of new improvements, to ensure the Act American of Incapacities, elimination and reduction of the costs related to the acquisitions, construction or reconstruction related, necessary or convenient for the previous propositions.</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuya obligación o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?
¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 - 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviando fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
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J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  YES 289  NO 290

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?  YES 295  NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

289 SI 贊成
Desea que se prohíba a las personas que hagan unaPerformante que sea más de 30 minutos de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

290 NO 反對

295 SI 贊成
Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

296 NO 反對

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
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INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dándidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

TO START VOTING, TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alloto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hilritas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Conn, 59 Chiapot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender’s office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Del, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorghi, 135 Gardeside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. McKinnis, III, 507 Los Palos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Mieden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Rennie, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St. #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO’S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City's budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party's candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded Indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, Improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
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PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:
- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling "temporary" bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:
- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City's economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: "As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs...but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools. Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue...but hastily collected requests for new buildings. . . ."

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O'Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O'Connell.

It's "politics as usual."

However, these cost saving measures are ignored:
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it's the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can't keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather "stick it" to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say "No" to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don't believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling "temporary" bungalows at the Richmond District's Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district's John O'Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be "stuck" with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting YES on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our workforce. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote YES on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscans community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.

It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money, they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

**Taxpayers deserve more accountability!**

**PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!**

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Eric Andresen, Director

---

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating!

San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical.”

**THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!**

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District adopt its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent

Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force

Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent

Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident

Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner

Commissioner

San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purposes stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000

for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of this state.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year. The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED Dispatch System, for Police, Fire and Emergency Medical Services.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B
Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”
On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can we afford to give Supervisors a blank check? VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE “CREATIVE” CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Irene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a “pay as you go” basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.
Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.
Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue successful, money saving program. Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called “Equipment Lease-Financing” and other “funny-money” credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to “anticipate” local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of “credit card government” with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970’s was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit “games” to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more “funny-money” credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote “NO” on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote “NO” on Proposition C.

Also vote “NO” on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, “lease financing occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20, $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
Police Staffing

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?  

Analysis 
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.6 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes

San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city's violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.

Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BEfooLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let's give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.
Let's set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The "prime" responsibility of Government is to "protect" its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it's a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims

Cristine Mack
Member

Helga D’Arcy
Member
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.
Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.
We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethard
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.
Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.
Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.
Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Irene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terece Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection.

The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That’s why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won elections in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Arthur Bruggze
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatayama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothshild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to its full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aline
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

 Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narses busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL

(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.

(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.

(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.

(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part I of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416

LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Moneys therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility’s operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992–93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries. Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E.
Put simply, it is bad government.
It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.
In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:
- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPOENNT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Caufien, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steinman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we can all be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident's Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

 Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and stocked.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden

Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Pull of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As a former mayor of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city's neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990's is convinced that the same community values and commitment exist today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lula Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it's the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteses
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Puerto, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city's neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hghts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 25 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchaisri
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal impudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:
The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!
Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.
Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.
What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!
But are you surprised?
This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.
Say "NO" to double-dipping!
Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.
The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.
To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.
Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.
What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?
Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.
Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons

(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:

(1) A retired person, who is a certified employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certified employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certified position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be (Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;

(b) Statements of the expenditures by item for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

(a) the overall mission and goals of the department

(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals

(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department

(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities

(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity

(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his or her commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Re-inventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

---

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committeeman and Past BART Board President
Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!

Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.

What a joke!

The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".

Vote "NO" on "G"!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City.

VOTE YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

**BREAK IT DOWN:** Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP:** Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT:** Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT:** Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME:** Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN:** Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

**Carole Migden**

Supervisor

---

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

**Supervisor Kevin Shelley**

---

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:

*Peter Donohue, Ph.D.*, consulting economist

*Marc Norton*, community activist

*Joel Ventresca*, budget and policy analyst

*Calvin Welch*, community activist

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

---

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn't be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn't be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn't deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:
- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.
Let's make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition I's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Airport BART Station

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp

Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.
San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.
But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We've paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city's general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.
We're sick of politicians saying, "Trust me!" With Proposition H we don't have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.
That's a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don't need to raise taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs and there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:
- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST

STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION 1!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopf’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft competing initiatives with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopf. You see, Kopf supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopf.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of bunko that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep's clothing: it's not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars. It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated. There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don't get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

VOTE NO ON PROP H.

Joe O'Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world's "Number One Tourist Destination," and one of the world's leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Koubal
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn't provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET'S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They've spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn't address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I -- BART INTO the Airport.
It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. It’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!
Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.
Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.
No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” ON H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ira Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Position I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka
Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drejke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawetz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;
(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SanTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;
(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to be safe as determined by the Federal Aviation Administration and other safety experts.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the station that is the closest to the nearest station off Airport property; the station that is the closest to the nearest station off Airport property; the station that is the closest to the nearest station off Airport property.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission’s determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTECTION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES ➞ NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “I” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot. 9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.

THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SFP’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “P” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SanTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “P” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “P.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition “I” station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 – $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition “I” requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition “I” station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition “I” because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote NO on wasteful spending.

Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LETS MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part "WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the terminal parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985 ...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.
Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.
Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.
VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Feltzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noo Valley Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It's vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let's be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn't been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don't let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let's move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it's time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clat
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

 Supervisor Angela Alioto
   President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
 Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
 Supervisor Terence Hallinan
 Supervisor Kevin Shelley
 Supervisor Willie Kennedy

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate
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It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseilt's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boundoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right.

VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREeway from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

• Plan for the short term and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.

Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems; BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Ahbolin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hodie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchay, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnette
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

• The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 15,100 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.

• The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.

• Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON PI!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz
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Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills an important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future's course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The "almost at the Airport" BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let's choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don't have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn't!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bukley
Jonathan Bukley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART into the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART into the Airport. Vote "YES" on "I"!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART INTO the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres.
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

David C. Spero
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San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the "most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location." Proposition I requires building the BART station in "the airport terminal area" — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.

• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.

• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.

• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition "I" would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.

• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.

• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.

• The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.

• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.

• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

• Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
• More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
• Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport? If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:

It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 -- $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 -- $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!
- If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lula Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 -- $500 million — but they haven't figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they've mentioned several "potential" sources of funding, but it's ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren't owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won't cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn't the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can't afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don't have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.
1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM. However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: if you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.
Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.
Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.
San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.
Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.
Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.
You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?
Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.
Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.
Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.
I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s, feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association
Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply
Geroge Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner
Association, Inc.
Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.
Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors
Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors
Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican
Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.
THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say’s we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.
Who’s civil rights are being violated?
We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!
If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state!
Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!
Proposition J wastes precious police resources.
Laws already exist to protect ATM users.
Proposition J violates the First Amendment.
You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.
Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.

Before you believe the politicians' claims that it "won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens," read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially "off-limits" for ordinary citizens. New "no lingering" zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to "linger" in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that "can be conducted" outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

* chat with a friend,
* distribute flyers,
* sip coffee,
* hail a cab,
* gather petition signatures, or
* read a newspaper.

Defining the act of "lingering" to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely "lingering" or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to "move along." Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of "no lingering" zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be "in your face" at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote "NO" on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimiter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121

THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of Francisco:

Section I. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public's safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions. (1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties. (1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “K”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot
On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor.
The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.
PROPOLENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in E. rental Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOLENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Banesmer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Caenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hester
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the author and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals and my friends.

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side? Your return address:

Place 29¢ stamp here. Post Office will not deliver mail without postage.

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
**OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS**
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>Republican Party</th>
<th>Precincts Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>8th Congressional District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd State Senate District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13th Assembly District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3001 through 3944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

---

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION -** To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check one below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send my ballot to the address on the label above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.O. Box or Street Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check below, if it is true for you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My NEW address is printed below. (Residence address ONLY.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Street Name, Apartment Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER - I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - **DO NOT PRINT**

The Date you signed: ___________________________  Your Day Time Phone Number: ___________________________
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

**EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY**

**REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION**

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)**

**Your Signature**

Print Your First Name

Print Your Last Name

Print the Address Where You Live

**Zip Code**

Day Phone

Eve. Phone

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:

**I HAVE a car:**

(Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

**SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS**

Assigned Precinct:

Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number:

Clerk:

Inspector:

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6 Code Reg. Attached Init'l.

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
Si desea recibir una copia de este libro en español, sírvase llamar al 554-4377
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .................. 11-30
2. the location of your polling place; ......................................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .................. back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ................................................................. 8
5. information for disabled voters; .......................................................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .................. 32-33
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................. 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and .................. 36
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. .................. inside back cover

Page 3
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:
ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:
ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs;
___ Lost use of both hands;
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE

Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures. If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
   • Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
   • Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:  IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coincidan con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，按合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perfora con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之后，把选票取出，沿虚线想起选票交給選舉站監選員。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.
RESPECT for ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE.

{DON'T YOU THINK?}

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F
(415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork composed by Monello Pypera Seymour.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 431
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY
8th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE
TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**  
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

| 1 |  
|---|---|
| **州長** (Governor) | **JEROME ‘JERRY’ MC CREADY**  
Businessman  
Hombre de negocios  
商人 |

| 2 |  
|---|---|
| **副州長** (Lieutenant Governor) | **ROBERT W. LEWIS**  
Director, Rowland Water District  
Director, Distrito de obras sanitarias de Rowland  
羅蘭水務區主任 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Dorothy Kreiss Robbins</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Nathan E. Johnson</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>George M. Mc Coy</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCURADOR GENERAL</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attorney General</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE. Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.</td>
<td>請選一人 Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>A. JACQUES&lt;br&gt;Retired Military Personnel&lt;br&gt;Personal militar jubilado 退休軍事人員</td>
<td>60 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO DE COMPENSACION, DISTRITO 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Member, Board of Equalization, District 1</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT. Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</td>
<td>請選一人 Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US SENATOR</strong></td>
<td>Paul Meeuwenberg</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US REPRESENTATIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE SENATOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**

Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

本區没有人備案競選此職位
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Candidate Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>總議員，第十二選管區</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>總中央委員會，第十二選管區</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>總中央委員會，第十二選管區</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

Vote for One
Vota por Uno
Vote for no more than 6
Vota por no más de 6
## NONPARTISAN BALLOT
### BALOTA APARTIDARIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>DELAINE EASTIN</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEWIS S. KEIZER</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERRY L. MARTIN</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILBERT SMITH</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT 'ROD' STEWART</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAL RICE</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN G. DIMARCO</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.
### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

---

**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**

**CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO**

**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994**

**MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.</th>
<th>1A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1992 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.</th>
<th>1B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| BALOTA | Voto | ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza la emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas presten trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las universidades al prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorará la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales. | 1C |
| 169    | Sí   |                                                                                  |     |
| 170    | No   |                                                                                  |     |

---

| F7 | 無黨派選票 |

---

**FON**

---

**19**
175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反对
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 – 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

191 SI 贊成
192 NO 反对
IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

198 SI 贊成
199 NO 反对
EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite a la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazará las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

无黨派選票 F8
無差等選票 F8
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

9E

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVA- TION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
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SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS ESTATALES

EXCLUSIÓN TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según lo define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazará las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

.keyCode=2021-04-05-09-37-58, type=markdown

211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反對

178

ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligir daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

KeyCode=2021-04-05-09-38-01, type=markdown

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對

179

LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza la emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

KeyCode=2021-04-05-09-38-04, type=markdown

224 SI 贊成
225 NO 反對

180

FaN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote YES</th>
<th>Vote NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

E  Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?  YES 263  NO 264

F  Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?  YES 270  NO 271

G  Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?  YES 274  NO 275

H  Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?  YES 278  NO 279

I  Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?  YES 283  NO 284
SAMPLE BALLOT
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ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

F11

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abierta una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

E

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

F

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反對

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

G

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y devolver fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

H

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de que se aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

J Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES 289
NO 290

K Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES 295
NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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← 289 SI 贊成
← 290 NO 反對

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

有人在使用自動提款機(ATM)提款時，如果有人在30尺內周遊散
溜超過一分鐘，應否予以禁止？

← 295 SI 贊成
← 296 NO 反對

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

應否批准獲得州公共機構資助的
公共單位在舊金山市、縣發展,
建築或購買低租金房屋，為低
收入的個人和家庭，包括老年
人或殘障人士提供數逾3,000個廉租
住屋單位？

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dandidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

Instrucciones en inglés están en la primera página.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

__________________________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor

My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor's office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Allot, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Ames Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hililita St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Mgd, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Mahler, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annamarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Cunn, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Morl, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wal Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Diane Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Gorgi, 135 Gardenside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO’S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $49.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propotions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as public safety, fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts, and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller's Statement on "A"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$95,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>56,356,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>152,356,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings. . . .”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
School Bonds

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it's the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can't keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather "stick it" to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say "No" to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don't believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling "temporary" bungalows at the Richmond District's Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district's John O'Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Roofed Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be "stuck" with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco's most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women's Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting YES on A.

Bay Area Women's Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators' or teachers' salaries. For the sake of our children's future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco's public schools cannot prepare our city's children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings.

By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote YES on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee  
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden  
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown  
Sheriff Michael Hennesey  
District Attorney Arlo Smith  
Assessor Doris Ward  
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Girando

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally-recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAYED ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.

It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($125 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing students’ test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!**

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

**Taxpayers deserve more accountability!**

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need re-habilitating!

San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”.

**THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!**

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

**Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent**

**Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force**

**Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent**

**Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident**

**Ron Norlin, Mission Resident**

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

**Merrier Turner Lightner**

Commissioner

San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN FOR SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur the bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the laws of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used in said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used in said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"
On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkener
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents' arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.

Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.

Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.

Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?  

YES  

NO  

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee  

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Submitted by Citizens Opposed To Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be *halted — not expanded* — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.
Vote "NO" on Proposition C.
Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease finance arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20,000,000, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES \[→\]
NO \[→\]

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Bierman and Hallinan.


PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.
San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.
Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.
Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.
None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FOOLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D!

Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.

This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!

The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. "CARPE DIEM."

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city's deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition "D" insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.

Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.

This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical "Full Force" Charter Amendment.

When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the "Full Force" of 1,971 sworn officers.

I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A "Full Force" means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.

The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don't let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.

In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won't get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.

Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.

We're tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we've been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.

Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor's Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor's decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.

We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Ammendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.

Furthermore, the Charter Ammendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!

Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can't become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That’s why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone  Roberta Boomer
Christopher L. Bowman  Donald A. Casper
Albert Chang  Rose Chung
Lee Dolson  James E. Gilleran
Anna M. Guth  Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama  Harold Hoogasian
John Sidline  Joanne "Jody" Stevens
Marc Wolin  Charles J. Wong
Lee B. Vanderveld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote "Yes" on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it’s full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
- clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
- police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
- police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
- narses busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
- jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
- cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
- vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
- police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
- police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

Section 3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL.

(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.

(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.

(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.

(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county to be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416

LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

1. The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

2. No later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users’ preferences as to the facility’s operating hours.

3. Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

4. The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

5. Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection. Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two and one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (1) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992—93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How "E" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot. 42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets. Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries. Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E.
Put simply, it is bad government.
It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.
In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:
- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police offers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks
Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.
But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.
If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.
Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.
Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.
Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.
In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.
Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.
Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don't have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelandter, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Robert Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kallil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellon
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.
Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?
As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.
Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.
Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.
I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.
Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.
Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.
San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?
But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.
If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.
Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.
Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.
These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.
Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of "direct democracy." Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorrwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacuriar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Marla Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchhai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in planning the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it—they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you—the voters of San Francisco—gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set-asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries—by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines, or health centers, or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986–1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Quentin L. Kopp
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Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES

NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
PROPOINENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOINENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Chairwoman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committee Chairwoman

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman

Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Chairwoman

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
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Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!
Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf.
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.
Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.
What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!
But are you surprised?
This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.
Say "NO" to double-dipping!
Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say "No" to Proposition "F."
San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.
The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.
To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.
Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.
What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?
Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.
Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member’s retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be
(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION F (Continued)

made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program.

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs.

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any item of the proposed estimate.

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay.

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

- a) the overall mission and goals of the department
- b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
- c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
- d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities
- e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity
- f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
- g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity
- h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its mission, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller's issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a “line-item” budget. This “line-item” budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department’s programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City’s “line-item” budget and replace it with a “mission-driven” budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department’s performance in the year before.

The “mission-driven” budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department’s success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a “line-item” budget to a “mission-driven” budget.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
The full text of Proposition G is on page 82.
G

Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City's current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public's needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary.

Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to "reinvent" government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a "Mission Driven Budget" is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — "Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations").

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service "deadwood", seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special "WARNING TO VOTERS" page in the front of this "Voters Handbook".

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — "rule-driven" San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their "Booie Board" of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE "NO" ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee Chairman of California Republican Party

Ario Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Chairman and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Chairman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” IS FOR “GOUGING”!

Proposition “G” is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.

What a joke!

The change from a “line item” to “mission driven” budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate “missions” and “goals” should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on “research” and “studies” to “implement” a “mission statement.” With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on “mission driven” budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”.

Vote “NO” on “G”!

Citizens for Budget Sanity

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
G
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

**BREAK IT DOWN**: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP**: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT**: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT**: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME**: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN**: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:

*Peter Donohue, Ph.D.*, consulting economist

*Marc Norton*, community activist

*Joel Ventresca*, budget and policy analyst

*Calvin Welch*, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

**Carole Migden**
Supervisor

---

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

**Supervisor Kevin Shelley**

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the “most cost-effective, safest and most convenient” BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to “divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes” to fund this project. “Essential City programs” are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “H” Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn't be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn't be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn't deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

• Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.

• Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.

• Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let's make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!

VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden

Supervisor Barbara Kaufman

Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow

Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“...The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggages 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Airport BART Station

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

-------

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3nds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

VOTE YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
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PROPSHION H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our
timeline goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.
San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to
support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.
But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to
$400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We’ve paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new
taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better
plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is
cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly
as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will
be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most
cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total
construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport
BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as
police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART
construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport
BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR
MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most
cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site —
without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing
from the city’s general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money
to build a single BART station that will only serve international
passengers.
We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition
H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the
BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most
convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and
former California Republican Party Executive Committee
member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the
airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost
effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the
airport on BART.
That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from
overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds
needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same
politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go
towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need
good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise
taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government
get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:
- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 - 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?
- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 - $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 - $400 million ($300 - $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area's economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 - 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT'S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don't want a station that's going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let's help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!

If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. 1 — BART INTO the Airport.

It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.

Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP. 1.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don't let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh's plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition I's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Dreijke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawetz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore
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AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government services;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE
EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT
SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(c), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof.

It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SanTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/ BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/ SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent’s Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Golland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Heilman
Art Groza

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don't be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City's general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City's general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City's general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop 1's opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don't be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is a world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strusky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport. We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors, from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hsieh's Prop. 1 approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right.

VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
- Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
- Plan for the short run and find yourself backed at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are bandaids that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unabskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't' be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes! Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former ‘tightwad Supervisor,’ is no spendthrift.

He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make

CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The

BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from

the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport

Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway. Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway. Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution. And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegner, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Abbotlin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and
direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and

improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchaj, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to

VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While

I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the

Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and

know that general fund money could never be used for BART into

the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and

other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to

mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money

can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without rely on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Cortez
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

• The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.

• The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.

• Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring, Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills an important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Jackson Wong
Restauranteur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
ERIC CHUNG
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile a away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!

VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART INTO the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.

John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed "environmentalist" cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat's meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT'S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the "most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location." Proposition I requires building the BART station in "the airport terminal area" — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport's light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport's 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.

NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco's Environment

John Holtsclaw, Sierra Club

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)

Proposition "I" would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:
- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtsclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.
BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport? If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What's more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

National Women's Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- **If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

- **If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!

- **If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zwanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
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PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES ↔ NO ↔

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot

On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.
This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J. San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable. You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potroo Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply

George Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner
Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican
Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say’s we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program. Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.

Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.

You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians' claims that it "won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens," read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially "off-limits" for ordinary citizens. New "no lingering" zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to "linger" in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that "can be conducted" outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

• chat with a friend,
• distribute flyers,
• sip coffee,
• hail a cab,
• gather petition signatures, or
• read a newspaper.

Defining the act of "lingering" to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely "lingering" or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to "move along." Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of "no lingering" zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be "in your face" at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote "NO" on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)
AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance. In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelssohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K
San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city's ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

---

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

---

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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### CANDIDATE STATEMENTS
- **Assessor**
  - Doris M. Ward: 32

- **Public Defender**
  - Jeff Brown: 33

### PROPOSITIONS
- Airport BART Station: 87
- ATM Area: 115
- BART to the Airport: 99
- Employment after Retirement: 77
- Equipment Lease Financing Limit: 51
- Library Fund: 65
- Low-Income Rental Housing: 123
- Mission-Driven Budgeting: 83
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- School Bonds: 37
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, **take this page with you to the polls**. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your **Polling Place** is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

---

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side? Your return address:

---

Place 29¢ stamp here. Post Office will not deliver mail without postage.

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco,
California
Permit No. 2750
CAR-RT SORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>American Independent Party</th>
<th>Precincts Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>8th Congressional District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th State Senate District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th Assembly District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001 through 2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2701 through 2714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2901 through 2919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:

☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.

☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number

City State Zip Code

Check below, if it is true for you:

☐ I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.
   My NEW address is printed below.
   (Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94141

Zip Code

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an
absentee ballot by any other means.

☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained
on page 5.

☐ All voters receive the English version.
   I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in:
   Spanish     Chinese

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

To contact you if there is a problem with your application:

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

The Date You Signed

Your Day Time Phone Number

Your Evening Phone Number
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POIILS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q. WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER
HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongo</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Sites  San Francisco Unified Schools  Multiple Poll Workers  Walden House

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)  Your Signature

Print Your First Name  MI  Print Your Last Name

Print the Address Where You Live  Zip Code

Day Phone  --  Eve. Phone  --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:  I HAVE a car:  (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

--------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---------

Assigned Precinct:  Home Precinct:  Clerk:  Inspector:


E.O. Bk.  6/2  6/6

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Voter Information Pamphlet  
Consolidated Primary Election, June 7, 1994

## GENERAL INFORMATION
- Poll Worker Application .................................. Inside Front Cover
- Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet ............... 3
- Access for the Disabled Voter ............................. 5
- Permanent Absentee Voter (Permanent Vote-by-Mail) Qualifications ........................................ 5
- Important Facts About Absentee Voting ...................... 6
- Your Rights as a Voter ..................................... 8
- How to Use Poll Star Vote Recorder ........................ 9
- Sample Ballot ............................................ 11-30
- City and County of San Francisco Offices to Be Voted on This Election ............................. 31
- Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures .............. 35
- Words You Need to Know ................................ 36
- Telephoning the Registrar of Voters ....................... 129
- Index ...................................................... 130
- Polling Place Card ....................................... Inside Back Cover
- Absentee Ballot Application ................................ Back Cover
- Location of Your Polling Place ........................... Back Cover
- Permanent Absentee Voter Application .................. Back Cover

## CANDIDATE STATEMENTS
- **Assessor**  
  Doris M. Ward ........................................... 32
- **Public Defender**  
  Jeff Brown ............................................... 33

## PROPOSITIONS
- A School Bonds .......................................... 37
- B 911 Dispatch Center Financing .......................... 47
- C Equipment Lease Financing Limit ........................ 51
- D Police Staffing ......................................... 55
- E Library Fund ........................................... 65
- F Employment after Retirement ............................ 77
- G Mission-Driven Budgeting ................................ 83
- H Airport BART Station .................................. 87
- T BART to the Airport .................................... 99
- J ATM Area ................................................ 115
- K Low-Income Rental Housing ............................ 123

---

Si desea recibir una copia de este libro en español, sírvase llamar al 554-4377  
如欲索取選民手冊中文本請電：554-4376

---

# PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. A **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......... 11-30
2. The location of your **polling place**; .......................................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. An application for an **Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent absentee voter status; .......... back cover
4. Your **rights as a voter**; ................................................................. 8
5. Information for **disabled voters**; .......................................................... 5
6. Statements from **candidates** who are running for local office; .................. 32-33
7. Information about each local **ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................. 37-127
8. Definitions of words you need to know; and .................................................. 36
9. A **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting; .................. inside back cover
28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."

2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone’s home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.

3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.

4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.

5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.

6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

____ Lost use of one or more limbs;
____ Lost use of both hands;
____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a "P" then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel). Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a postcard with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may "fax" your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE

Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavoogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar's Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:

• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR

• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**STEP 1**

**SPECIAL NOTE:**
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

**USING BOTH HANDS**
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把帶鉛之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。
RESPECT for ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE.

{ DON'T YOU THINK? }

Find yourself a best friend.
We're open 7 days a week,
12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F
(415) 554-6364.
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SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 432
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota. 中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
PASE A LA PAGINA SEGUIENTE
請轉下頁開始投票
TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1

GOVERNOR

JEROME 'JERRY' MC CREAM
Businessman
Hombre de negocios 商人

2

VICEGOVERNADOR
Lieutenant Governor

ROBERT W. LEWIS
Director, Rowland Water District
Director, Distrito de obras sanitarias de Rowland 羅蘭水務區主任

18
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Dorothy Kreiss Robbins</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Nathan E. Johnson</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>George M. Mc Coy</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Vote por Uno**
- **Vote for One**
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

STATE

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY
PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO

ESTATAL

CONVOCATORIA PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS

PROCURADOR GENERAL
Attorney General

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.
没有人備案競選此職位

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS
Insurance Commissioner

A. JACQUES
Retired Military Personnel
Personal militar jubilado

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

在美国 出版
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

4

US SENATOR

Paul Meeuwenberg
Marketing Consultant
Asesor de comercialización 市場推廣顧問

80

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY
PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO

STATE SENATOR

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本區没有人備案競選此職位</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Central Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本區没有人備案競選此職位</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## NONPARTISAN BALLOT
BALOTA APARTIDARIA
無黨選派票

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surgeon General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAINE EASTIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleísta / 教師－女議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS S. KEIZER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator / Educador / 教育工作者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRY L. MARTIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者－管理顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILBERT SMITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 商人、教育工作者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher / Maestro / 教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAL RICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 高中教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/School Trustee / Maestra/Síndico escolar / 教師／校董</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN G. DIMARCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育內閣秘書</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 ➔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSEOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor 估稅官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 ➔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Defender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 ➔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

YES 159
NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

YES 163
NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

YES 169
NO 170
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1A

1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISICOM
Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. El acta permite la
emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares
($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa
de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B

1994 DE ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Esta acta permite
una emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de
dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de
capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas
y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses
que surja del mismo de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de
Bono para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para
la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C

1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES 
DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad
económica de California y recuperar la alto calidad de ventajas
de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por
un valor de dos millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para
fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y uni-
versidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán
trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando
oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y
estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y uni-
versidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados
y competitivos. Repararán y construirán las aulas de las
escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las universidades para
prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán
alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a
una educación superior. Mejorará la calidad del aprendizaje en
las ciudades universitarias, mejorando las aulas y propor-
cionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los pro-
yectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias incluyen
pero no están necesariamente limitos a, mejora
en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad,
actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con
los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los
centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y
construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte
del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos
administrativos generales.
8E

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER’S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
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185 SI 贊成
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1996 - 96. Costos desconocidos para potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

186 NO 反對

191 SI 贊成
IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre las aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

192 NO 反對

198 SI 贊成
EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

199 NO 反對

F8 無黨派選票

175 176 177
178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
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211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反對
EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

178

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對
ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infringir daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

179

224 SI 贊成
225 NO 反對
LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

180
A  SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

B  Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

C  Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

D  Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

↑ 237 SI 贊成
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $85,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones o actualizaciones, construcciones nuevas, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

↑ 238 NO 反对

↑ 244 SI 贊成
¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiación por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

↑ 245 NO 反对

↑ 251 SI 贊成
¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

↑ 252 NO 反对

↑ 256 SI 贊成
¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplée un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con una énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?

↑ 257 NO 反对

FaN
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

## 11E

**NONPARTISAN BALLOT**

**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?</td>
<td>YES 263</td>
<td>NO 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?</td>
<td>YES 270</td>
<td>NO 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?</td>
<td>YES 274</td>
<td>NO 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?</td>
<td>YES 278</td>
<td>NO 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?</td>
<td>YES 283</td>
<td>NO 284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga abierta una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反对

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反对

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
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J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES 289
NO 290

K
Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES 295
NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反对

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que hagan un depósito en una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

有人在使用自动提款机(ATM)提款时，如果有人在30尺内阅读或者
超过一分钟，是否予以禁止?

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反对

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyan personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

应否授权获得州公共机构资助的
私发起人在旧金山市、新
建、建设或购买低租金屋，为低
收入的个人和家庭，包括老人
或残障人士提供不超过3000个
租金单位?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票终
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dandidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "Sí" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

---

選民須知:

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或換過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你摳過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，
請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.
The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES
On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.
The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor's office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorestein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Berman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasho Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chubor Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammlano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Slot Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardenside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cheryl A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAtee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO’S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What Is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller’s Statement on “A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

"Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings..."

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- “Contracting out” routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.

- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting YES on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings.

By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote YES on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid's future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children's educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City's economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children's education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn't it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren't running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that's the fallacy of Proposition A.

It's no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco's schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of $99 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco's public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn't working, it won't get you anywhere.

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don't have to pay? Everyone's quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn't do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That's why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we've shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn't it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn't their priorities be increasing student's test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Bruce A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

Taxpayers deserve more accountability!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating!
San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”.

THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices. Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco's prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can't make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated.

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each vote to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($23 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco's 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let's send a message to City Hall. We're tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check? VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco's 911 problems can't be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

As chair of the City's Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.

Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.

Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.

Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES ▶
NO ▶

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
**Equipment Lease Financing Limit**

**PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C**

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter-approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax-exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful money-saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

**REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C**

**DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER??**

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money-saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Woman
Iline Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE “NO” ON “FUNNY-MONEY” PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called “Equipment Lease-Financing” and other “funny-money” credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to “anticipate” local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of “credit card government” with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970’s was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit “games” to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more “funny-money” credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote “NO” on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote “NO” on Proposition C.

Also vote “NO” on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 therefor to read as follows:

(a) The Board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES ➡️
NO ➡️

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City’s budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.

San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city's violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes. Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BE FOOLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let's give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Don Dillon
Sue Bierman

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let's set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.
Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers' Association supports "Citizens for Safer Streets" in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.
Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.
I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.
Proposition D won't raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.
Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The "prime" responsibility of Government is to "protect" its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it's a priority.
Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zaheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. "CARPE DIEM."

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

- - - - - - - - - - -

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city's deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.

Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.

This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.

When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.

I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conway

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.

The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.

To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.

In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.

Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.

We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.

Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.

We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.

Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!

Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection.

The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Arthur Braczone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatayama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

Robert Brummer
Donald A. Casper
Rose Chung
James E. Gilleran
Sam T. Harper
Harold Hoogastan
Joanne "Jody" Stevens
Charles J. Wong

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote "Yes" on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it's full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDBUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department—and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote NO on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
- clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
- police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
- police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
- narcs busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
- jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
- cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
- vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
- police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
- police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.

(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.

(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.

(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal years 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users’ preferences as to the facility’s operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection. Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992–93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot
On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government's priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
- a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
- a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
- money for a respectable book budget;
- a library for the blind;
- the main library;
- much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco's Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government. It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million. In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

• Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
• Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
• Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
• Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition. If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steinman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Robert Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Falus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident's Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco's branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn't necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We're promised the moon and we get Pecora. Can't they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children's Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of "Reading Centers", and Books, Books, Books: that's what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that's what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city's neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990's is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it's the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

  Jim Rivaldo
  Al Baum
  Chuck Forester
  Tanya Neiman
  Tom Ammiano
  Lawrence Wong
  Leslie Katz
  Roberto Esteves
  Del Martin
  Phyllis Lyon
  Doriswin Buck Jones
  Jim Haas
  Bill Walker
  Tim Wolfred
  Mike Housh
  Rick Pacuraj
  Matthew Rothschild
  Jim Hormel
  Ray Mulligan
  Mark Leno
  Kevin McCarthy
  Carole Cullin
  Ken Foote
  Robert Barnes
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A "Closed" sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Marita Moten, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city's neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We're not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today's budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that's needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It's a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Pritti, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahinsa Sunchais
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Reene Dordsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.
VOTE NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines, Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission.

In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of "quick fixes" which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
Employment after Retirement

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman

Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Woman

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!

Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf.

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised!

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!

Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!

Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading"
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.
Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.
Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.
Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.
Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSAL F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.
The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowances shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

(a) the overall mission and goals of the department

(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals

(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department

(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities

(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity

(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall henceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller's issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
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PROPOSITION G
Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES ➤
NO ➤

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary.

Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party.

Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committeeman and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!
Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control. What a joke!
The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.
About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition "G".
Vote "NO" on "G"!
Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.
Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.
The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.
Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.
The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.
Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City's budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need "Neighborhood-Based Budgeting":

**BREAK IT DOWN:** Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn't.

**OPEN IT UP:** Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in *public hearings.*

**GET IT OUT:** Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT:** Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME:** Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN:** Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:

*Peter Donohue, Ph.D.,* consulting economist  
*Marc Norton,* community activist  
*Joel Ventresca,* budget and policy analyst  
*Calvin Welch,* community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government's wasteful budget process. Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases. Reduce the waste in City Hall! Please join me in voting **YES on G.**

**Carole Migden**  
Supervisor

____________________________________

No government needs "reinventing" more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City's budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G.**

**Supervisor Kevin Shelley**

____________________________________

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G
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Airport BART Station

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES  ☒  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

• Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.

• Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.

• Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it's written so you'll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H's supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO's planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What's needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.

But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We've paid our fair share!

Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

---

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We're sick of politicians saying, "Trust me!" With Proposition H we don't have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost-effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That's a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don't need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

• Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
• Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
• Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

• A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10-16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
• A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

• The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
• The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
• If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAYED ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. H will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 - 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!

San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!

A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!

If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. Its motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.

It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop. H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. It’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherrick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Airport BART Station

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Dreke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irina Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:
SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."
SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:
(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government services;
(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-railway station connecting BART, Caltrain, SanTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle; and
(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.
SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; and the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and BART to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and BART employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and BART employees; the shortest required walking or wheelchair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SanTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “I” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the iniciative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco's reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport's $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport's operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SP's General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don't want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn't be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport's expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let's seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It's the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition "P" is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 - 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition "P" does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 - $400,000,000 is not available:
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
- All "surplus" funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
- San Francisco's Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn't right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn't guarantee City monies won't be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let's not blow it.

Vote NO on "I."

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending.

Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

PAYED ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holtzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LETS MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION II

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreaux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part:

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh, pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation. Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strusky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinaoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentín L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport. We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conway
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hsieh's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

- Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
- Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

VOTE YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't' be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!
Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!
Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.
Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.
Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.
Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.
And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.
Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Welcher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Ahbolin, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orielia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.
I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years.
BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills an important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider

Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider

Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist

Richmond Young
HIV Task Force

Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist

Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation

Les Pappas
AIDS Educator

Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restaurantaur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA

David E. Lee
Community Activist

Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals

Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission

Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Florence Fang
Businesswoman

Roland Quan
CPA
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future's course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The "almost at the Airport" BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let's choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don't have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn't!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired), S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bukley
Jonathan Bukley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART into the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART into the Airport. Vote "YES" on "I"!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the "most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location." Proposition I requires building the BART station in "the airport terminal area"—which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport's light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport's 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco's Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition "I" would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10–16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100–$400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100–$400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

• Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
• More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
• Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.
Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 - $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- **If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says that San Francisco must take "all necessary actions" to build a $300 - $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

- **If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn't financially feasible!

- **If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn't as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren't cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 - $500 million — but they haven't figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they've mentioned several "potential" sources of funding, but it's ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren't owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won't cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn't the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can't afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don't have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain, and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh  
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Willie Brown  
Speaker, California State Assembly
Bill Maher  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
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PROPOSITION J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES ⇒ NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How “J” Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
ATM Area

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J. This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM's while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM's.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM's is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlers must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can't help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn't be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Milet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply

Geroge Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say’s we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.
Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.
Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state!
Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!
Proposition J wastes precious police resources.
Laws already exist to protect ATM users.
Proposition J violates the First Amendment.
You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.
Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians' claims that it "won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens," read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially "off-limits" for ordinary citizens. New "no lingering" zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.
The only people authorized to "linger" in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that "can be conducted" outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
• chat with a friend,
• distribute flyers,
• sip coffee,
• hail a cab,
• gather petition signatures, or
• read a newspaper.
Defining the act of "lingering" to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely "lingering" or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to "move along." Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of "no lingering" zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?
Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be "in your face" at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.
Vote "NO" on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) by adding Section 121 Thereto Prohibiting Persons from Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public's safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How "K" Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSPENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSPENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON'T HAVE TO "APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS."

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer's check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let's not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Banzemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors
PAY ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsum Digidigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

I love any mos. They are our frends.

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
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Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Supt. of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?  
Your return address:

Germaine Q Wong  
San Francisco Registrar of Voters  
City Hall – Room 158  
400 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you. The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

---

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION** - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election, **SIGN** this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check one below:</th>
<th>Check below, if it is true for you:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send my ballot to the address on the label above.</td>
<td>I have moved since the last time I registered to vote. My NEW address is printed below. (Residence address ONLY.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P.O. Box or Street Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.</th>
<th>To contact you if there is a problem with your application:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.</td>
<td>Your Signature - <strong>DO NOT PRINT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.</td>
<td>The Date You Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All voters receive the English version. I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish____, Chinese____.</td>
<td>Your Day Time Phone Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Signature - **DO NOT PRINT**

The Date You Signed

Your Day Time Phone Number

Your Evening Phone Number
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Sites     San Francisco Unified Schools     Multiple Poll Workers     Walden House

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge everyone who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr) Your Signature

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

Print the Address Where You Live Zip Code

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

--------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct: 

Affidavit Number: Clerk: Inspector: 

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6 Code Reg. Attached Init'I.

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......................... 11-30
2. the location of your polling place; ........................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .......................... back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ........................................... 8
5. information for disabled voters; ........................................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ........................................... 32-33
7. Information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and
   against the measure, and the legal text; ........................................... 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and ........................................... 36
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. ........................................... inside back cover
Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There’s an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs;
___ Lost use of both hands;
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Ossel
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar's Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:

1. Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR

2. Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabezitas rojas.

第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把带碰之选举针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之后，把选票取出，沿虚线提起选票交给选举站监选员。

STEP 4

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votacion.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 433
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-in Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE
TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>JEROME ‘JERRY’ MC CREDAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOVERNADOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>ROBERT W. LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Rowland Water District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Distrito de obras sanitarias de Rowland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vote for One**

**Vote por Uno**

**Vote por Uno**

**Vote por Uno**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>DOROTHY KREISS ROBBINS</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>NATHAN E. JOHNSON</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>GEORGE M. MC COY</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

3

州檢察長
PROCURADOR GENERAL
Attorney General

請選一人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto. 没有人備案競選此職位

州

保険委員
COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS
Insurance Commissioner

請選一人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

A. JACQUES
Retired Military Personnel
Personal militar jubilado 退休軍事人員

60 →

平準局委員，第一區
MIEMBRO, CONSEJO DE COMPENSACION, DISTRITO 1
Member, Board of Equalization, District 1

請選一人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

本區没有人備案競選此職位
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

4

US SENATOR
SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS
United States Senator
PAUL MEEUWENBERG
Marketing Consultant
Asesor de comercialización 市場推廣顧問

Vote for One

80

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

Vote for One

THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito.

Vote for One

3A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Member, State Assembly, District 13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>請選一人</td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Member, County Central Committee, District 13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>請選不超過八名</td>
<td><strong>Vote for no more than 8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

## NONPARTISAN BALLOT

**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Information</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| State Superintendent of Public Instruction | DAVID L. KILBER  
Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官                              | 135          |
|                            | CAROL S. KOPPEL  
Educator / Educador / 教育工作者                               | 136          |
|                            | LEWIS S. KEIZER  
Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師                                  | 137          |
|                            | PERRY L. MARTIN  
Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師 | 138          |
|                            | FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE  
Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者 - 管理顾问 | 139          |
|                            | JOSEPH D. CARRABINO  
Businessman / Hombre de negocios / 商人, 教育工作者 | 140          |
|                            | WILBERT SMITH  
Teacher / Maestro / 教師                                     | 141          |
|                            | ROBERT "ROB" STEWART  
Teacher/School Trustee / Maestra/Síndico escolar / 教師 / 校董 | 142          |
|                            | HAL RICE  
Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育内阁秘书 | 143          |
|                            | GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN  
Teacher / 教师                                                      | 144          |
|                            | MAUREEN G. DIMARCO  
Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleista / 教師 - 女議員                  | 145          |
|                            | DELAINE EASTIN  
Assessor / Asesor                                                     | 146          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Information</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assessor                  | DORIS M. WARD  
Assessor / 估税官                                                              | 150          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Information</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public Defender           | JEFF BROWN  
Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco / Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco / 公共辯護律師 | 155          |
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

YES 159
NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

YES 163
NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

YES 169
NO 170
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPORCIONES ESTATUALES

1A
ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETRIBUCIÓN SÍSMICA Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B
ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el proyecto de construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C
ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crean empleos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes, y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Reapararán y reconsatrán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas a asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las universidades públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero proveniente de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.
175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters' credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons' access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $50 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás.
Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 – 96.
Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

186 NO 反對

191 SI 贊成
IMPOSICISION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Exima a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

192 NO 反對

198 SI 贊成
EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Permite a la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

199 NO 反對

無黨派選票 F8

FaN

日本語

非牟利団体、立法性憲法修正案、除免有資格の非牟利団体
徴収地方政府の商業牌照費や
根據収入或銷售議題而徵收的費
用、財政影響：在短期內地方政府
的税收全無，或只是極微的
影響。

物業税免除、傷痍人士通路、立
法性憲法修正案、容許立法會
免除建物的物業稅，如果該建
物的建造、增建、移去，或改
裝現存的全部或部份是否使傷
痍人士容易退出或容易使用，財政
影響：數年後地方政在物業
稅收的損失每年將達1千萬元左
右，校區的損失（大約是全部的
一半）將由州政府補貼。
PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT.
LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitu-
tion to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation
equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact:
Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up
to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school
districts (about half the total).

MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT.
Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree
murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at
another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury.
Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVA-
TION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of
almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated
areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay
off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds.
Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to
operate and maintain properties.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

211 SI 贊成
EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los definan la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazará las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

212 NO 反對

218 SI 贊成
ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligirle daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

219 NO 反對

224 SI 贊成
LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

225 NO 反對

物業稅排除，保存水資源，立法性憲法修正案。修改州憲法來排除對物業徵收物業稅。如果該物業因農作關係而進行立法議會裁定的，包括農場保存水和農業設備的改革。財政影響：數年之後，地方政府物業稅損的損失，每年可達1千萬元，學校校園承擔的損失（全部的一半）將由州政府補貼。

誅殺：刑罰，立法性憲法修正案。規定如果故意從車窗內用槍械射擊罪犯的另一個人，並且意圖造成嚴重人身傷害的，一旦被判二級謀殺之後，刑期將會是20年徒刑至終身監禁。財政影響：有未知的，但不會是龐大的州政府開支的增加。

224 SI 贊成

225 NO 反對

選項：法規，立法性憲法修正案。批准發行債券達20億元以獲得，開發，保護，及保護適合在加州各處的指定地帶。財政影響：州政府將會有內年費用的費用，以償還20億元之本金及16億元之利息的債券。未知的，可能達數千萬元的州及地方政府的開支而能付及維持地產。
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

B
Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

C
Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**
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**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

### E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

- **YES 263**
- **NO 264**

### F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

- **YES 270**
- **NO 271**

### G

Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

- **YES 274**
- **NO 275**

### H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

- **YES 278**
- **NO 279**

### I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

- **YES 283**
- **NO 284**
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263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establa un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反对

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反对

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de items sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
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J Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM? YES 289 NO 290

K Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled? YES 295 NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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J

289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反对

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazanean o se quedan dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

有人在使用自动提款机(ATM)提款时，如果有人在50尺内闲逛或
长超过一分之一，是否予以禁止？

K

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反对

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

是否授权政府机关资助的
公私发起人在旧金山市、县发
展、建筑或购买低价房屋，为低
收入的个人和家庭，包括老年人
或残疾人士提供数逾3,000个出租
住房单位？

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票终
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INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfura la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título “Balota para un dandato no listado.”

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras “SI” o “NO.”

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borradoras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

Instrucciones en inglés están en la primera página.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

TO START VOTING, TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Malillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alloto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorestein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Celil Williams, 60 Hildritas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumashero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Conn, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Morf, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammlano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardenside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City's cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today's dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond "debt service" during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. ("Debt Service" is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city's outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children's fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor's calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.

2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.

3. The Mayor.

4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.

5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.

6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.

2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.

3. The Mayor.

4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.

5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.

6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded Indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $95,000,000
- Bond interest 56,356,250
- Debt service requirement $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,612 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOHENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:
- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling "temporary" bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:
- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City's economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOHENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: "As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs...but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

"Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...""

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O'Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O'Connell.

It's "politics as usual". Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling "temporary" bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco's most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women's Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco's public schools cannot prepare our city's children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings.

By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco's strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It's simple enough: The city's old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today's youth and prepare tomorrow's workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Eusteneuer

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

Taxpayers deserve more accountability!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco's prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can't make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REQUITING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION, AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses therefrom or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

 Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference hereinafter made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION

PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We're tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

“LEASE FINANCING” EQUALS “MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY”!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE “CREATIVE” CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a “pay as you go” basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.

Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results. Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.

Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES  ☑  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WASTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Chairman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committee Member

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

1 to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

2 to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

3 to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20, $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 126 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.

San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.

Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44

Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FOOLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D!

Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION D
In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.
By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.
Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.
Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.
Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.
They are wrong.
It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.
Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.

This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!

The San Francisco Police Officers' Association supports "Citizens for Safer Streets" in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won't raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The "prime" responsibility of Government is to "protect" its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it's a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.

The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims

Cristine Mack
Member

Helga D'Arcy
Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. "CARPE DIEM."

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.
Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city's deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.
Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.
We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.
Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.
Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Nev Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.
Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition "D" insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical "Full Force" Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the "Full Force" of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A "Full Force" means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.
Don't let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.
Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won't get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We're tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we've been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.
Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Irene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor's Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor's decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can't become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection.

The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chung
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatayama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee R. Vandezfeld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it’s full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO
PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib
bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand
document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever
1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco
Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and
containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling
document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to
implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not
1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department
personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or
perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs
or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the
level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Depart-
ment — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors
is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor
and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget
ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and
why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994 – 1995 budget ordinance
of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition
D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY
TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD
EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no
reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us
any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it
already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete
Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget
buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the
ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns
about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need
200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police
department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents
compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland,
and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neigh-
borhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better manage-
ment that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and
efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote No on D.

Joe Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It
locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as
$17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical
services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addi-
tion to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for
courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such
measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very
elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in
police services through strong management and new technologies,
and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is
needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
PAYED ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narcotics busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL.
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of this charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992–93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current City services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot
On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
- a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
- a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
- money for a respectable book budget;
- a library for the blind;
- the main library;
- much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment Is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E.
Put simply, it is bad government.
It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries' budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.
In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:
- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city's bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city's health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.
If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.
Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPOSERS' ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department's budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you're going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You've got a thing or two to learn about "good government".
Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It's not enough to promise you'll keep them open when you're unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.
Since you've been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.
In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That's why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.
Empty rhetoric won't work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won't fall if Proposition E passes. It's unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.
Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco's Public Libraries

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children — a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TDNC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sehene Selari, TDNC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linniea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: it guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Miller, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Strong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade.

Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco's branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn't necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carolee Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of "Reading Centers", and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background feel that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leomila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBrider
  Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorothy Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carla K. del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynn, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
June Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Oronberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifitt, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacker
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sunchai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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Once upon a time, a magnificent city by the bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. **They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.**

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. **Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government.** Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

**Vote NO on Proposition E.**

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

---

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — **by taking it away from other vital city programs.**

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.**

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 — 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax **BEFORE** it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

**Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.**

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp
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Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?  

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against "Freeloading"
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!
Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reul!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.
Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.
What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!
But are you surprised!
This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.
Say "NO" to double-dipping!
Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading"
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY'S PERSONNEL COSTS.
The City Charter's ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.
To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.
Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.
What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?
Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.
Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs. Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid. Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need. Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 1, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee, who enters into such a consultancy contract, shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member’s retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment. 8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission-driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates
The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget
Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

(a) the overall mission and goals of the department

(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals

(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department

(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities

(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity

(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall henceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments
It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains
Within thirty days of the Controller's issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to reordering those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a “line-item” budget. This “line-item” budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department’s programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City’s “line-item” budget and replace it with a “mission-driven” budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department’s performance in the year before.

The “mission-driven” budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department’s success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a “line-item” budget to a “mission-driven” budget.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITOR’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services.

The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary.

Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITOR’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book *Reinventing Government*, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shnitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

---

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Mission-Driven Budgeting

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!

Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control. What a joke!

The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".
Vote "NO" on "G"!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
The City's budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers.
San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need "Neighborhood-Based Budgeting":

**BREAK IT DOWN:** Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn't.

**OPEN IT UP:** Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT:** Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT:** Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME:** Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN:** Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
*Peter Donohue, Ph.D.*, consulting economist
*Marc Norton*, community activist
*Joel Ventresca*, budget and policy analyst
*Calvin Welch*, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government's wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

*Carole Migden*
Supervisor

No government needs "reinventing" more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City's budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

*Supervisor Kevin Shelley*
Airport BART Station

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden. The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn't be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn't be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn't deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let's make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
PAY ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.

But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We’ve paid our fair share!

Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

———

San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We're sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Radel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules). BART (if extended to SFO), future high-speed rail to LA and San Trans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10-16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 - $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high-speed rail, and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 - $400 million ($300 - $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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Vote YES on Proposition H!
Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.
A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.
The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.
The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.
Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST

STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.
Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.
If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!
If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing; it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!

Frank Cveticov
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H. IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!
We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

V.P. John Maher Irish-American Political Club

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!
Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.
Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colin
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Hetke Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.H. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka
Valley Trails and Art Network

Frank J. Murphy
Babette Dreffe
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and the new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheelchair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission’s determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE
EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT
SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of
transportation services by the San Francisco Bay
Area Rapid Transit District to and within San
Francisco International Airport, together with
provisions for funding thereof, and providing a
severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and
County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most
efficient, effective and economical means of
improving rapid transit services to and from the
San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is
by means of an extension of the rail service
provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid
Transit District (BART) to a passenger station
located within the Airport terminal area. Such an
extension will best serve the residents of both San
Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Air-
port workers, airline customers, tourists and per-
sons traveling between the Airport, San
Francisco and other Bay Area locations served
by BART. The people of the city and county find
and declare that the extension of such rapid tran-
sit services to a point within the Airport terminal
area is in the best interest of said city and county
and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that
the actual station location within the Airport ter-
minal area shall be one which attracts the most
passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city
and county that a BART passenger station be
constructed within the area of the Airport termi-
nals and that all necessary actions be taken by the
city and county to secure extension of BART rail
service directly into the Airport terminal area. To
implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of
Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies,
including airport commissioners, with any
authority over any aspect of the extension of the
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
into the Airport shall adopt such further ordi-
nances and resolutions and take all other actions
as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of
BART service into the San Francisco Interna-
tional Airport terminal area as a part of BART
expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commis-
sion shall take all appropriate actions to generate
the revenue necessary to finance the BART
extension and station construction referred to
herein, which shall first include the utilization of
available Airport, regional, state and federal
funds, and may include the adoption of a pas-
genier facility charge as authorized by Section
1513(o), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States
Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized
passenger facility charge shall not exceed a
period of five years unless necessary to complete
the aforementioned construction and unless
extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of
Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility
charge may occur only if the airports commission
has applied for and secured federal authorization
to spend the revenue therefrom for the construc-
tion of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivi-
sion, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordin-
ance or any part thereof is for any reason held
unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court
of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not
affect the validity of effectiveness of the remain-
ning portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof.
It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each
section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause
or phrase thereof, would have been passed
irrespective of the fact that any one or more other
sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs,
clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitu-
tional, invalid or ineffective.
**BART to the Airport**

**PROPOSITION I**

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

**A “YES” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

**A “NO” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

**Controller’s Statement on “I”**

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

**How “I” Got on the Ballot**

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

**Notice to Voters:** Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.

THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco's reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport's $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport's operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF's General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don't want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn't be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport's expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let's seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It's the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUZZTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “P” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “P” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:
• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million - for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services - MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:
- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote NO on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent’s Argument Against Proposition I
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on 1!

Lee Golan
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s passenger mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION II! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollock
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Graceman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I – Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural "trace" already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport. We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails. It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih’s Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don’t be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes! Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn’t in the airport and doesn’t meet the needs of today’s business travelers? Let’s do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I. Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former "tightwad Supervisor," is no spendthrift. He's for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fliegner, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Ahbolten, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst. — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Aahmsa Sarnachi, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Amelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don't always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it's about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it's the right thing for San Franciscans.

I've been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grandchild, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We've taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the ban of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

| Jackson Wong | Fiona Ma |
| Glenn Tom | CPA |
| Restauranteur | |
| Ben Hom | David E. Lee |
| Businessman | Community Activist |
| Mae Woo | Douglas Chan |
| SF Film Commissioner | Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals |
| Joe Kwok | Calvin Louie |
| Businessman | Commissioner, Human Rights Commission |
| Jonathan Leong | Thomas Ng |
| Businessman | Commissioner, Fire Commission |
| Eric Chung | Florence Fang |
| Businessman | Businesswoman |
| Anton Qiu | Roland Quan |
| Realtor | CPA |

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies. VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile a way from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans! VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H! VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.

John A. Ernola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART INTO the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero

Christine Hansson  
Keith Consoer, Pres  
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors  
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.  
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors  
Barbara R. Meskunas  
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street  
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA  
Dorice Murphy  
Evelyn L. Wilson
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.

NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment

John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock.
Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.
BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.
Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shinko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 — $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 — $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!
- If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 — $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh  
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission  

Willie Brown  
Speaker, California State Assembly  

Bill Maher  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
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PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.
The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
**PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J**

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

---

**REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J**

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s *really* prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people *unable to conduct their business elsewhere* can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, *rather than addressing serious crime problems*.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so *large* it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with *legitimate* business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor *really* appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are *public property* and the Courts are clear that *everyone is entitled to use them*.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J. San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlerings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association
Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply
George Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.
Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors
Connie Ramirez, Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors
Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition says we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?
We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!
If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.

Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.

You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

**June 1, 2, and 3**

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.
PROPPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON'T HAVE TO "APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS."

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let's not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

---

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Briggs
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlin Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsim Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution. Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be. Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca  
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY  
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.  

☐
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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- Absentee Ballot Application .......................... Back Cover
- Access for the Disabled Voter ......................... 5
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- Important Facts About Absentee Voting .............. 6
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## CANDIDATE STATEMENTS

- **Assessor**
  - Doris M. Ward ........................................ 32

- **Public Defender**
  - Jeff Brown ............................................ 33

## PROPOSITIONS

- Airport BART Station .................................. 87
- ATM Area .................................................. 115
- BART to the Airport .................................. 99
- Employment after Retirement ......................... 77
- Equipment Lease Financing Limit .................... 51
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- Low-Income Rental Housing .......................... 123
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- Proposition B ........................................... 47
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- Proposition E ........................................... 65
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POLLING PLACE CARD: Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Supt. of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?
Your return address:

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691

Place 29c stamp here.
Post Office will not deliver mail without postage.
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco,
California
Permit No. 2750

CAR-RT SORT

Ballot Type
American Independent Party
433

Precincts Applicable
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District
3001 through 3944

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number

City
State
Zip Code

Check below, if it is true for you:
☐ I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.
My NEW address is printed below.
(Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9411

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an
absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained
on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version.
I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in:
Spanish_____, Chinese_____

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

To contact you if there is a problem with your application:
The Date You Signed
Your Day Time Phone Number
Your Evening Phone Number
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER
HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongo</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Sites | San Francisco Unified Schools | Multiple Poll Workers | Walden House |

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)  Your Signature

Print Your First Name  MI  Print Your Last Name

Print the Address Where You Live  Zip Code

Day Phone  --  Eve. Phone  --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

------------------------------------ SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ------------------------------------

Assigned Precinct:  Home Precinct:  

Affidavit Number:  Clerk:  Inspector:  

E.O. Bk.  6/2  6/6  Code  Reg. Attached  Init'l.

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA  94102
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<table>
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<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor</strong> Doris M. Ward</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Defender</strong> Jeff Brown</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>37</td>
</tr>
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---

Si desea recibir una copia de este libro en español, sírvase llamar al 554-4377  
如欲索取選民手冊中文本請電: 554-4376

---

### Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); 11-30
2. the location of your **polling place**; (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an **Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent absentee voter status; back cover
4. **Your rights as a voter**; 8
5. information for **disabled voters**; 5
6. **statements from candidates** who are running for local office; 32-33
7. **Information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and 36
9. a **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting. inside back cover
28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate’s political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1  Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter”, you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs;
___ Lost use of both hands;
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a "P" then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE

Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kaib, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando los dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，契合于二红点之上。

STEP 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把带的选票插入，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4
After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之后，把选票取出，
请保留起选票交给选框站监督员。
Respect for Animals Should Be Human Nature.
{ Don't You Think? }

Find yourself a best friend.
We're open 7 days a week,
12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork composed by Mastertype Repro Services.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 442
PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文说明印在选民手册最后一页的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
PASE A LA PAGINA SEGUINTE
TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLORIA ESTELA LA RIVA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Organizer/Printer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizadora política/Impresora</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICEGOVERNOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. LUIS GOMEZ</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountant/Educator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contador/Educador</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>ISRAEL FEUER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Organizer/Educator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>ELIZABETH NAKANO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>RICHARD D. ROSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Groups Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Treasurer</td>
<td>JAN B. TUCKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Private Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROCURADOR GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Defense Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado de defensa criminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>計票排名</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insurance Commissioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empleado de oficina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>計票排名</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participate in primary election for state legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPECIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>米班委員、第一區</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO DE COMPENSACION, DISTRITO 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization, District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>計票排名</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**

Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

本區没有人備案競選此職位
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US SENATOR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELIZABETH CERVANTES BARRON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestra de educación especial 特別教育教師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LARRY D. HAMPSHIRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poeta 詩人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| US REPRESENTATIVE |  |
| <strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</strong> |
| <em>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</em> |
| <strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</strong> |
| <em>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</em> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee, District 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NONPARTISAN BALLOT
**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**

### SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DELAINE EASTIN</strong></td>
<td>Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleista / 教師－女議員</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAVID L. KILBER</strong></td>
<td>Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAROL S. KOPPEL</strong></td>
<td>Educator / Educador / 教育工作者</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEWIS S. KEIZER</strong></td>
<td>Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERRY L. MARTIN</strong></td>
<td>Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE</strong></td>
<td>Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者－管理顧問</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO</strong></td>
<td>Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 商人、教育工作者</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILBERT SMITH</strong></td>
<td>Teacher / Maestro / 教師</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART</strong></td>
<td>High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 高中教師</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAL RICE</strong></td>
<td>Teacher/School Trustee / Maestro/Síndico escolar / 教師／校董</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN</strong></td>
<td>Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育内閣秘書</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAUREEN G. DIMARCO</strong></td>
<td>Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育內閣秘書</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY AND COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DORIS M. WARD</strong></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEFF BROWN</strong></td>
<td>Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco / Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A
EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

1B
SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

1C
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

1A
ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emision de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dolares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sismico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B
ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite la emision de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dolares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversion de capital para la construccion o mejora de las escuelas publicas y la autorizacion de asignar los fondos de los terremotos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificacion de Eseduales de 1952 para la construccion o mejora de escuelas publicas en la actualidad.

1C
ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad economica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza la emision de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dolares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades publicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearan trabajos y fortaleceran la economia del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitacion laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades publicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararan y reconstruiran las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortaleceran las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionaran alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educacion superior. Mejoraran la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias publicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologias de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias publicas incluyen, pero no estan necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualizacion de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos cientificos, mejoras y modernizacion de los centros de computacion de las ciudades universitarias y construccion de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastara ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters' credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons' access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
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185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反對

CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $50 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 – 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

187 SI 贊成
188 NO 反對

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

190 SI 贊成
191 NO 反對

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite a la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

175

無黨派選票 F8

192 NO 反對

193 SI 贊成

194 NO 反對

195 SI 贊成

196 NO 反對

197 SI 贊成

198 NO 反對

199 NO 反對
PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
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211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反对

EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier obra efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反对

ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligirle daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

224 SI 贊成
225 NO 反对

LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENOS DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares para manejar y mantener las propiedades.
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

 Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

 Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

 Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?
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237 SI 贊成
237A BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyan modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para atacar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

238 NO 反對

239 SI 贊成
244A 为了建设一个综合的紧急救援调度中心和协调相关设备，包括一个信息辅助调度系统，用于警察、消防和紧急医疗服务，市政府应与市、县信用公司或类似的非营利公司签订一项租用信用方案，该信用额度不得超过六千万美元 ($60,000,000).

245 NO 反對

251 SI 贊成
251A 市政府应制定信用额度的信用额度上限，从20,000,000美元增加到40,000,000美元，并在此后每年增加5%，若不必使用信用额度。

252 NO 反對

256 SI 贊成
256A ¿Desea que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?

257 NO 反對
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**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?</td>
<td>YES 263</td>
<td>NO 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?</td>
<td>YES 270</td>
<td>NO 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?</td>
<td>YES 274</td>
<td>NO 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?</td>
<td>YES 278</td>
<td>NO 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?</td>
<td>YES 283</td>
<td>NO 284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
一致

263 SI 赞成
264 NO 反对

Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores a los que los mismos hayan en el año fiscal 1993-94 y que esté un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando en el fondo una cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en el fondo anualmente, y que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga abierta una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

F

270 SI 赞成
271 NO 反对

Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 600 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajen?

E

274 SI 赞成
275 NO 反对

Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de items sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en caso proyecto?

G

278 SI 赞成
279 NO 反对

Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

H

283 SI 赞成
284 NO 反对

Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancele para los pasajeros, por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  

YES 289  
NO 290

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?  

YES 295  
NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反對

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se quedan dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反對

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler humano para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?
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Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.
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CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swan, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alito, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco
Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Berman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annmarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardendise Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mckins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAtter, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Milgden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodls, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College
Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO'S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (”Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a "Yes" vote means, and what a "No" vote means. There is a statement by the City's Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument"

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument"

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: 56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $35.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs… but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings…”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- “Contracting out” routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco's most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting YES on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
School Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.

It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea...the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!**

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! **Taxpayers deserve more accountability!**

**PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!**

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

*Eric Andresen*<br>Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for "door rehabilitation." In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It's not the doors that need rehabiliting! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, **Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!**

*Tim Carrico*<br>President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children's Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O'Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as "temporary" and further alleges that their condition is "critical". **THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!**

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. **Vote NO on Measure A.**

*Linda De La Rosa*, Mission Resident & John O'Connell HS Parent

*Andrew L. Solow*, Member — Mayor's Mission Task Force

*Vicki Rega*, Mission Resident & John O'Connell HS Parent

*Alfred M. Lopez*, Mission Resident

*Ron Norlin*, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don't have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It's time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

*Merrier Turner Lightner*<br>Commissioner<br>San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions. It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS AS AMENDED WE WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

It is ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purposes stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed thereby the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

The estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereof received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be held in the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such general election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE “CREATIVE” CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Abio Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results. Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B. Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B. Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
PROPOSITION C
Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WASTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
John Riordan
Past College Board President
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, “leasing financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction on acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
Police Staffing

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol? YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.
San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.
Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city's violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.
We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.
Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.
Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.
Money for more police is available without increasing taxes. Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.
None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.
Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.
This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BE FOOKED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!
If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.
Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.
As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAY ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.
Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.
Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.
I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.
Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.
Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The “prime” responsibility of Government is to "protect" its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state.
Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. "CARPE DIEM."

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.
Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city's deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.
Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.
We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.
Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.
Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.
Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition "D" insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco. Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force. This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical "Full Force" Charter Amendment. When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the "Full Force" of 1,971 sworn officers.

I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A "Full Force" means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172. The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don't let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets. In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won't get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.

Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.

We're tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we've been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.

Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Irene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor's Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor's decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.

We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.

Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can't become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection.

The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That’s why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period. That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dotson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it’s full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? **Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.**

**VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!**

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

*Kenneth Cera*

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

*David C. Spero*

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy. **Vote No on D.**

*Joel Ventresca*

Budget and Policy Analyst

**Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.**

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D**

*Jeff Brown*

Public Defender

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

---

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
- clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
- police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
- police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
- narcotics busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
- jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
- cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
- vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
- police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
- police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol, and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users’ preferences as to the facility’s operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection. Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-a-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by other public agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
**PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
- a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
- a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
- money for a respectable book budget;
- a library for the blind;
- the main library;
- much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

*Diane Filippi*
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

---

**REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

*San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure.* No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

*Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase.* In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall. Vote **NO on Proposition E**.

*Frank M. Jordan*
Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E.
Put simply, it is bad government.
It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.
In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:
- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.
Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.
Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.
In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.
Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/ Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Boveland, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children — a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sebene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mealone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landsis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade.

Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth. Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails. Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system. Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is. Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases. Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth. Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against
the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I
understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past
and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the
community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.”
Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, commu-
nity and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on
the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch
library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community
College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local
extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on
Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need
for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible
branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It
is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans
deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax
increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require
tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours
for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be
restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the
new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key com-
ponent of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the
21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on
Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult
to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with
inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true
neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled
is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by
allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for
the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at
least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would
require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood
libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children
will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning
that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to
succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is
why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter
Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is
essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system
is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and
economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply
not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave
San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs
will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without rais-
ing taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to
Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time
librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money
spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in
our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next
generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our
economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

_Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party_
_Asembly Speaker Willie Brown_
_Asembly Member John Burton_
_Central Committee Members:_
  * Jeanna Haney*
  * Marie Plazewski*
  * Rev. Arnold Townsend*
  * Peter Gabel*
  * Vivian Wiley*
  * Alexa Smith*
  * Karen Fitzgerald*
  * Patrick Fitzgerald*
  * Eddie Chin*
  * Lulu Carter*
  * Leslie Katz*
  * Matthew Rothschild*
  * Natalie Berg*
  * Caitlin Curtin*
  * Claire Zvanski*
  * Maria Martinez*
  * Mike Bosia*
  * Mary Johnson*
  * Elaine Collins-McBride*
  * Ronald Colthirst*

_Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open._

_Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close._

_In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries._

_Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E._

_Jim Rivaldo_
_Al Baum_
_Chuck Forester_
_Tanya Neiman_
_Tom Ammiano_
_Lawrence Wong_
_Leslie Katz_
_Roberto Esteves_
_Del Martin_
_Phyliss Lyon_
_Dorrwin Buck Jones_
_Jim Haas_
_Bill Walker_
_Tim Wolfred_
_Mike Housh_
_Rick Pacurar_
_Matthew Rothschild_
_Jim Hormel_
_Ray Mulligan_
_Mark Leno_
_ Kevin McCarthy_
_Carole Cullum_
_Ken Foote_
_Robert Barnes_
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynn, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city's annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what's important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City's last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we're to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco's unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hghts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O'Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City's 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children's education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can't afford to lose its libraries. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Atimsha Sumchay
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lantier
Ronald Colthirst
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Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
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Library Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set-asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences. Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp
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Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?  

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Employment after Retirement

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against "Freeloading"
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committee Member
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
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Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

“F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!
Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.
Proposition “F” would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.
What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!
But are you surprised!
This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.
Say “NO” to double-dipping!
Say “No” to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say “No” to Proposition “F.”

San Franciscans Against “Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.
The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.
To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.
Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.
What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?
Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.
Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 1, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member’s individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolition.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member’s individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolition.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;

(e) Such other information as the Mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

a) the overall mission and goals of the department
b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities
e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity
f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity
h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall henceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
PROPOSITION G

Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?  

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
**PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G**

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services.

The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

**REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G**

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book *Reinventing Government*, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shnitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

**VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G**

Citizens For Budget Sanity

**Terence Faulkner**  
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party

**Arlo Hale Smith**  
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President

**Alexa Smith**  
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

**Andrew de la Rosa**  
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

**Irene Hernandez**  
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

**Max Woods**  
Past Republican Central Committeeman

**Robert Silvestri**  
Republican Central Committeeman
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Mission-Driven Budgeting

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!

Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.

What a joke!

The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".

Vote "NO" on "G"!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
  Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
  Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
  Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
  Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
  Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

**BREAK IT DOWN:** Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP:** Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT:** Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT:** Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME:** Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT Plain:** Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
*Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist*
*Marc Norton, community activist*
*Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst*
*Calvin Welch, community activist*

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

**Carole Migden**
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

**Supervisor Kevin Shelley**

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G
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PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the “most cost-effective, safest and most convenient” BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to “divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes” to fund this project. “Essential City programs” are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “H” Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn't be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn't be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn't deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let's make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LAGuardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

VOTE YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Airport BART Station

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system. But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We’ve paid our fair share!

Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We’re sick of politicians saying, "Trust me!" With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100–$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses, CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked. Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self-serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Koubal
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H. IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. It's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!! We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Thomas F. Hayes
Former BART Director

Patrick J. Dowling
Anne Quilter
Charles J. Sullivan
Mary C. Sullivan
Joan Finucane
Dan Dunnigan
Margaret Mylett
William Fitzgerald
Julia Fitzgerald
Thomas McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Patricia Hayes
Mary O'Donnell
V.P. John Maher Irish-American Political Club

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!
Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.
Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.
No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.
AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. "YES" ON I AND "NO" on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka
   Valley Trails and Art Network

Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Expanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that those funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to be the safest under the federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheelchair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE
EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT
SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot. 9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.
BART to the Airport

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROPPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
- All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
- San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART.

This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition “I” station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition “I” requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition “I” station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition “I” because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent’s Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION II! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go "almost" to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LETS MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION II!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part “WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the “BART trace” is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

“RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport.”

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healan
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what's right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I – Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Ravetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noo Valley Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Mata, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!! Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinosa, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conway
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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It’s sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don’t want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It’s just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco’s reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!
VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih’s Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let’s Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O’Shea
John Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don’t’ be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes! Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn’t in the airport and doesn’t meet the needs of today’s business travelers? Let’s do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Welcher, Secretary
Dina Fiegner, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Ahbolin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carla del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years.

BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue. VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills an important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn, For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed "environmentalist" cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat's meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT'S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
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San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area”—which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won't get people out of their cars.
And there's no planned way to pay for it.
Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take "all necessary actions" to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn't financially feasible!
- If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn't as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren't cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven't figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they've mentioned several "potential" sources of funding, but it's ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren't owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won't cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn't the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can't afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don't have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.
1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.
   The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.
   VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly
Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
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PROPOSITION J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.
The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.
This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM's while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.
Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM's.
Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.
San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.
Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM's is not a good use of scarce Police resources.
Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.
You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?
Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.
Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can't help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.
Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn't be in the zone, will be made to move.
I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply

Gerge Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.
There are no laws that prohibit a person from standing inches away from you while you are doing your banking.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say’s we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, we need our rights protected!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Ario Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.
Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.
Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.
You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians' claims that it “won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

• chat with a friend,
• distribute flyers,
• sip coffee,
• hail a cab,
• gather petition signatures, or
• read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121
THERE TO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

It is ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime-fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making illegitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each violation committed, and for each violation committed, if charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each violation committed, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each violation committed, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each violation committed, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES ⇐

NO ⇐

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance. In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How "K" Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to **double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000.** Besides doubling your tax burden, **this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located.** Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? **Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood.** With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

**Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check.** Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project. **Vote NO on Proposition K.**

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith  
Democratic Central Committee Member  
Arlo Hale Smith  
Democratic Central Committeeman  
Terence Faulkner  
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party  
Robert Silvestri  
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will **not increase** anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health. Proposition K will **not** give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better. Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. **Vote Yes on K.**

Frank M. Jordan  
Mayor  
Sue Bierman  
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee  
Randy Shaw  
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic  
Ronald E. Bansemer  
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

---

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city's ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

---

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Cullinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yuttum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer's Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don't know when, we don't know where, and we don't know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Visit or call us today:
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
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Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side? Your return address:

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
Office of the Registrar of Voters
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

Ballot Type
442

Peace and Freedom Party
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

Precincts Applicable
2301 through 2612
2801 through 2816

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:
[ ] Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
[ ] I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

YOUR MAILING ADDRESS

Check below, if it is true for you:
[ ] I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.
[ ] My NEW address is printed below. (Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9411

P.O. Box or Street Number
City
State
Zip Code

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.

[ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
[ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
[ ] All voters receive the English version.
[ ] I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish, Chinese

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature: **DO NOT PRINT**

The Date You Signed

Your Day Time Phone Number

Your Evening Phone Number

To contact you if there is a problem with your application:
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER
Honor Roll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)  [ ] / [ ] / [ ]

Your Signature

Print Your First Name [ ]
Print Your Last Name [ ]

Print the Address Where You Live [ ]

Zip Code [ ]

Day Phone [ ] -- [ ]
Eve. Phone [ ] -- [ ]

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car. [ ] (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

--------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---------

Assigned Precinct: [ ]

Affidavit Number: [ ]

Home Precinct: [ ]

Clerk: [ ]

Inspector: [ ]

E.O. Bk. [ ]

6/2 [ ] 6/6 [ ]

Code [ ]

Reg. Attached [ ]

Init'l. [ ]

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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### PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); 11-30
2. the location of your **polling place**; (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an **Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent absentee voter status; back cover
4. your **rights as a voter**;
5. information for **disabled voters**;
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office;
7. **Information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and 36
9. a **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting. inside back cover

Page
28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

- Lost use of one or more limbs;
- Lost use of both hands;
- Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
- Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
- Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
- Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day.
If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. She will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q. Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.
Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters.
Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.

7
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-ins. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
   • Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;
   
   OR
   • Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

**SPECIAL NOTE:**
**IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.**

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

**STEP 1**
Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.
Usando los dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
請雙手將選票插入自動機中

**STEP 2**
Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabechitas rojas.

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**
Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perforé con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
請把票戳之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**
After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entrégradela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。
RESPECT FOR ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE. Don't you think?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F
(415) 554-6364.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 443
PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite, the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE
請轉下頁開始投票

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Gloria Estela La Riva</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Political Organizer/Printer, Organizadora política/Impresora. 該該活動組織者／印務人員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>J. Luis Gomez</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom Party</td>
<td>Accountant/Educator, Contador/Educador, 會計師／教育工作者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Ballot**

**Consolidated Primary Election, June 7, 1994**

City and County of San Francisco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel Feuer</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Nakano</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard D. Rose</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan B. Tucker</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Party/Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization, District 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**

Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

本區沒有人喚案競選此職位
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

JUNE 7, 1994
7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
九四四年六月七日

US SENATOR

Larry D. Hampshire
Poet
Poeta 諸人

Elizabeth Cervantes Barron
Special Education Teacher
Maestra de educación especial 特別教育教師

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.
本區没有人備案競選此職位

STATE SENATOR

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.
本區並無此職位之競選
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

STATE ASSEMBLY

MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13
Member, State Assembly, District 13

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.
本區没有人備選競選此職位

BENNIE WALDER

COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 13
Member, County Central Committee, District 13

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.
本區没有人備選競選此職位

BENNIE WALDER

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
PARTIDO DE LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.
本區没有人備選競選此職位

BENNIE WALDER

3P
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
BALOTA APARTIDARIA
無黨派選票

州教育廳長
SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Vote for One

DAVID L. KILBER
135

CAROL S. KOPPEL
136
Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官

LEWIS S. KEIZER
137
Educator / Educador / 教育工作者

PERRY L. MARTIN
138
Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師

FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE
139
Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師

JOSEPH D. CARRABINO
140
Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者 - 管理顧問

WILBERT SMITH
141
Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 貿人、教育工作者

ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART
142
Teacher / Maestro / 教師

HAL RICE
143
High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 高中教師

GLORIA MATTU TUCHMAN
144
Teacher/School Trustee / Maestro/Síndico escolar / 教師／校董

MAUREEN G. DIMARCO
145
Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育內閣秘書

DELAINE EASTIN
146
Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleísta / 教師－女衆議員

估税官
ASSESOR
Assessor

Vote for One

DORIS M. WARD
150
Assessor

公共辯護律師
DEFENSOR PUBLICO
Public Defender

Vote for One

JEFF BROWN
155
Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco 公共辯護律師
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

YES 159
NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

YES 163
NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

YES 169
NO 170
ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SÍSMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.  

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y de arquitectura que asignarán los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza la emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas universitarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crean trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universitarias preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias y universidades preparar a los estudiantes de futuro terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al transporte público y a los pantalones para asistir a la educación superior. Mejorarán el tiempo de aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vírgenes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

F7

Sample Ballot
Consolidated Primary Election, June 7, 1994
City and County of San Francisco

Medidas sometidas al voto de los electores — Proposiciones Estatales

1A

Si 159

No 160

F7

无党派选票

1B

Si 163

No 164

1C

Si 169

No 170

F7
RENTER’S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成 175
CRÉDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás.
Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 – 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

186 NO 反對
无黨派選票 F8

191 SI 贊成 176
IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

192 NO 反對

198 SI 贊成 177
EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS.
ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probabilidades de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

199 NO 反對

FaN
PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994

211 SI 贊成
EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD, EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA.
ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según lo define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

212 NO 反对

218 SI 贊成
ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Establece una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligir daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

219 NO 反对

224 SI 贊成
LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENOS DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTORICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

225 NO 反对

178

179

180
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

10E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction
and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including
facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply
with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous
materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or
convenient for the foregoing purposes.

B
Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County
of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation,
the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed
the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the
purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equip-
ment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency
medical services?

C
Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment
without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the
limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers,
with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

237 SI 贷成
238 NO 反对

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

244 SI 贷成
245 NO 反对

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluya un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

251 SI 贷成
252 NO 反对

¿Desea que el limite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho limite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

256 SI 贷成
257 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un enfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
SAMPLE BALLOT
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

E
Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week? YES 263 NO 264

F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? YES 270 NO 271

G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process? YES 274 NO 275

H
Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs? YES 278 NO 279

I
Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government? YES 283 NO 284
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

263 SI 贊成
Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores a aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

264 NO 反對

270 SI 贊成
Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tenían habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

271 NO 反對

274 SI 贊成
Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

275 NO 反對

278 SI 贊成
Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

279 NO 反對

283 SI 贊成
Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad toma todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancele para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?

284 NO 反對
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MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine (“ATM”) for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  YES 289  NO 290

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?  YES 295  NO 296

END OF BALLOT
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Opción 1</th>
<th>Opción 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático (&quot;ATM&quot;) durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?</td>
<td>289 SI</td>
<td>290 NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Opción 1</th>
<th>Opción 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyan personas anclanadas o incapacitadas?</td>
<td>295 SI</td>
<td>296 NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIN DE LA BALOTA**

票終
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BAlOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dándidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradora en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borradoras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

---

SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

選民須知:

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有變改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你撕過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorestein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirtas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierenan, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kenney, 50 Chumashero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Leavlin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Ollive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wal Yang Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dau, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Guardsende Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldsteln, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cheryl A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 365 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO’S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a "Yes" vote means, and what a "No" vote means. There is a statement by the City's Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument"

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument"

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $58,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:
- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools. “Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.
Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:
- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- “Contracting out” routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting YES on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote YES on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arla Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

San Francisco Association of Realtors
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! Taxpayers deserve more accountability!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andrews, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating!
San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”.

THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF VOTING THEREOF; PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballot used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions. It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Calling Election)
Calling and Providing for a Special Election to Be Held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 7, 1994, for the Purpose of Submitting to the Voters of the City and County of San Francisco a Proposition to Incur the Following Bonded Debt of the City and County for the Acquisition, Construction or Completion by the City and County of San Francisco of the Following Municipal Improvements, to wit: Ninety-Five Million Dollars ($95,000,000) for Acquisition, Construction and/or Reconstruction of Certain Improvements for the San Francisco Unified School District; and that the Estimated Cost of City and County of Said Municipal Improvements Is and Will Be Too Great to Be Paid Out of the Ordinary Annual Income and Revenue of the City and County and Will Require Expenditures Greater Than the Amount Allowed Therefor by the Annual Tax Levy; Reciting the Estimated Costs of Such Municipal Improvements; Fixing the Date of Election and the Manner of Holding Such Election and the Procedure for Voting For or Against the Proposition; Fixing the Maximum Rate of Interest on Said Bonds and Providing for the Levy and Collection of Taxes to Pay Both Principal and Interest Thereof; Prescribing Notice to Be Given of Such Election; Consolidating the Special Election with the General Election; and Providing That the Election Precincts, Voting Places and Officers for Election Shall Be the Same as for the General Election.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated: San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition: "San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency. The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

“LEASE FINANCING” EQUALS “MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY”!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE “CREATIVE” CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a “pay as you go” basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco's 911 problems can't be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results. Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B. Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City's Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B. Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSITION’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C
Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITION’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER??

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE “NO” ON “FUNNY-MONEY” PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called “Equipment Lease-Financing” and other “funny-money” credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to “anticipate” local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of “credit card government” with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970’s was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit “games” to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more “funny-money” credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote “NO” on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote “NO” on Proposition C.

Also vote “NO” on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
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PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?  

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City’s budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes

San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city's violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.

Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BE FOOLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers. This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes. The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zaheer Earakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D'Arcy
Member
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. "CARPE DIEM."

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noo Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco. Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force. This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment. When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers. I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172. The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing. Don’t let your safety be jeopardized. Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers. To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets. In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks. Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.

We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen. Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested. We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.

Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!

Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection.

The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That’s why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That’s why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it’s full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't the Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994—1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges VOTE NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy. Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment. Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narc busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is now.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilize and as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds or accounts by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to maintain the requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, as provided above. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot
On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
Library Fund

PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government.

It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.

In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police offers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
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As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don't have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguerio, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children — a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don't pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It's just that simple. Let's take chances with our kids' futures. Let's guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco's future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women's Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sefene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children's Council of San Francisco

San Francisco's branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: it guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed "reading centers" but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millei, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Bernan, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Robert Ruzic, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalit
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident's Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of "direct democracy." Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City's budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City's future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city's economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leomila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city's neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990's is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it's the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop. E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorrwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A "Closed" sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Marla Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winstow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city's neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We're not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today's budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that's needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It's a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Malia
BART Director Michael Bernick
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We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hghts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Akinsa Sumchae
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
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Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set-asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straightjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged, but in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
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Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Employment after Retirement

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City's $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City's high unemployment rate, why doesn't San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against "Freeloading"
Max Woods
  Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
  Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
  Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
  Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
  President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
  Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
  Democratic Central Committee Woman
Irene Hernandez
  Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
  Past President BART Board
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“F” IS FOR “FREE-LOADING”!

Proposition “F” is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition “F” would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised?

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say “NO” to double-dipping!
Say “No” to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say “No” to Proposition “F.”

San Franciscans Against “Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to hire qualified retired people to do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government’s labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons

(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:

(1) A retired person, who is a certified employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certified employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b) (2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(b) (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b) (2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(b) (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the
qualified electors of the City and County of San
Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and
county by amending Section 6.201 and adding
Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to require-
ments for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco hereby submits to the
qualified electors of said city and county at an
election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to
amend the Charter of said city and county by
amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections
6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated
by bold face type; deletions are indi-
cated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates
The classification of proposed expenditures
included in budget estimates shall be uniform for
all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and
branches. The estimates shall include or be ac-
companied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense
of conducting each department, bureau, division,
office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, to-
gether with a separate schedule of the proposed
work program.

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for
the last complete fiscal year, together with a sepa-
rate schedule of the proposed work programs:

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or de-
creases, as compared with the current fiscal year,
in any items of the proposed estimate.

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations
showing any increases or decreases in the num-
ber of positions or rates of pay.

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the
chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget
Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no
later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each depart-
mental budget shall describe in detail each
proposed activity of that department and the
cost of that activity. In addition, each depart-
ment shall provide the Mayor and Board of
Supervisors with the following details regard-
ing its budget:

a) the overall mission and goals of the department
b) the specific programs and activities con-
ducted by the department to accomplish its
mission and goals
c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the
department
d) the service outcome desired by the cus-
tomer(s) or client(s) of the department’s pro-
grams and activities
e) strategic plans that guide each program
f) productivity goals that measure progress
h) the extent to which the department
achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its mis-
sions, goals, productivity objectives, service
objectives, strategic plans and spending con-
straints identified in subsections a through f
during the fiscal year.

It is the intention of the people of this mission driven budget process to be phased in
over the three year period mentioned in this
section with the Mayor identifying for each of
the three years approximately one-third of the
City departments that shall therefrom be
required to comply with the requirements of
this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2.
Departmental budget estimates shall be pre-
pared in such form as the Controller, after
consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget
Commitments
It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or
Commission ultimately responsible for the
management of each department to certify to
the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the pro-
grams and activities with specified levels of
performance for specified costs as outlined in
the budget description and other information
required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and
Revenue Gains
Within thirty days of the Controller’s issu-
ance of the combined annual financial report
of the City and County of San Francisco, the
Controller shall report to the Mayor and the
Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to
which each department has succeeded in the
prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured
by the difference between projected and expe-
rienced expenditures and the extent to which
each department in the prior fiscal year has
recovered additional revenues measured by
the difference between projected and experi-
enced revenues. The people of the City and
County of San Francisco declare that it shall
be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the
Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this re-
port, through the supplemental appropriation
process to give serious consideration to re-
warding those departments that the Controller
certified pursuant to this section exceeded
their revenue goals or met or exceeded depart-
mental operational goals expending less than
had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES ➡
NO ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a “line-item” budget. This “line-item” budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department’s programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City’s “line-item” budget and replace it with a “mission-driven” budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department’s performance in the year before.

The “mission-driven” budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department’s success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a “line-item” budget to a “mission-driven” budget.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services.

The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary.

Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE "NO" ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee man of California Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
MISSION-DRIVEN BUDGETING

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!
Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.
What a joke!
The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.
About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".
Vote "NO" on "G"!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.
Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.
The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.
Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.
The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City's budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need "Neighborhood-Based Budgeting":

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn't.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!
Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs "reinventing" more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City, BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot
On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to

JOIN US IN SUPPORTING PROPOSITION H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!

VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport Light Rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it's written so you'll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H's supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO's planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What's needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country's largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board's duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its "support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport". This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp's argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station "at the Airport" located "on Airport property."

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can't afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.

San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.

But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.

We’ve paid our fair share!

Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.

Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.

Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.

Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.

It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.

It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.

It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can't afford to approve any scheme that's proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that's really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won't cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won't jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don't want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport's 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn't leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn't cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There's been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can't afford to raise taxes or raid the City's general fund to pay for it if there's a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city's general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!
Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area's economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.
A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 - 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.
The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT'S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don't want a station that's going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs. Let's help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.
Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repeated it after six months.
Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.
Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!
If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By proposing a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.

It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H. IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.

Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO —

VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Thomas F. Hayes
Former BART Director

Patrick J. Dowling
Anne Quilter
Charles J. Sullivan
Mary C. Sullivan
Joan Finucane
Dan Dunnigan
Margaret Mylett
William Fitzgerald
Julia Fitzgerald
Thomas McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Patricia Hayes
Mary O'Donnell

V.P. John Maher Irish-American Political Club

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO's brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. "YES" ON I AND "NO" on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly

Former San Francisco Police Commissioner

Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECT
ION OF THE MOST COST-EFFEC
TIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION
SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNA
TIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and
County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as
"The Cost-effective BART to the Airport
Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of
San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and
County of San Francisco to use available revenues
and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible
in order to fund critical government service;
(b) BART and other regional transit agencies
have already agreed to pay for extending BART
to a multi-transit Airport station connecting
BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport
rapid light rail shuttle;
(c) San Francisco residents and businesses
should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART
station when property and sales taxes have been
paid for decades on the promise that these funds
would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and
County that any BART station constructed at
the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest
and most convenient, and that all necessary
actions shall be taken by the City and County and
its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective,
safest and most convenient station site be
selected for construction. To implement such
law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the
Airports Commission, and all City and County
officers and agencies with any authority over any
aspect of the construction or funding of a BART
station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances
and resolutions and take all other actions neces-
sary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest
and most convenient BART station site be
selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance,
all of the following factors shall be considered in
determining the most cost-effective BART sta
tion at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest
actual construction costs per passenger to extend
rail service from the nearest station off Airport
property to one on Airport property; the station
that uses the lowest actual construction costs to
extend rail service from the nearest station off
Airport property to one on Airport property; the
station that uses the lowest actual construction
costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport
property; the station that uses the lowest cost per
passenger to build the actual Airport station on
Airport property, and the station that entails the
lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting
current Airport operations and current or
approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance,
the safest BART station at the Airport shall be
the one that is determined to best meet federal
standards for Airport safety and for such hazards
as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance,
all of the following factors shall be considered in
determining the most convenient BART station
at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for
the operation of BART service to the Airport; the
shortest average travel time for all airline passen
gers and Airport employees to airline terminals
and employee work areas; the least disruption or
delay to current travel to and use of the Airport
by airline passengers and Airport employees; the
least disruption or delay to new mass transporta
tion services to the Airport for airline passengers
and Airport employees; the shortest required
walking or wheelchair distance from transit
stops; and, the least disruption or delay to com-
pletion of the planned Airport light-rail system
and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain
and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall
make the determinations provided for in this
ordinance by using available data from the Met
ropolitan Transportation Commission, BART,
other regional transit agencies, and studies con
ducted by the Airport. Such determinations by
the Airports Commission shall be final and con
clusive unless two-thirds of the members of the
San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within
thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's
determinations under this ordinance to reject
these determinations. If such determinations are
rejected, the Airports Commission shall recon
sider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Super
visors, the Airports Commission, and all City and
County officers and agencies with any authority
over any aspect of construction or funding of a
BART station at the Airport shall neither divert
any City or County funds from essential City and
County programs nor raise City or County taxes
to construct a BART passenger station within the
area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service
directly into the Airport terminal area. For pur
poses of this ordinance, essential City and
County programs refer to those involving police,
fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance
for any reason be held to be invalid or unconsti
tutional, or its application be held invalid to any
circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance
and its application to other circumstances shall
not be affected thereby but shall remain in full
force and effect. The People of the City and
County of San Francisco hereby declare that they
would have passed each part of this ordinance
irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalid
ity of any part or parts thereof.
ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof.

It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordnance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
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PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “P” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “P” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending.

Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent’s Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate Convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

___________________________
BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on II!

Lee Golan
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

___________________________
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It's an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of Improving rapid transit. Let's vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION II!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it's by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let's not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let's model our Airport's future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Hofstingr, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go "almost" to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco's public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco's status as a world class city.

LET'S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION II!

Robert P. Varsi
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Graceman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants' Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Heallman
Art Groza

---

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Hertliy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It's vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport's $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART's own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let's be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won't improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!

Whether you're a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promise of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn't been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don't let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let's move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it's time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conway
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It’s sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don’t want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It’s just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco’s reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hsieh’s Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let’s Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O’Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:
• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don’t be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn’t in the airport and doesn’t meet the needs of today’s business travelers? Let’s do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!
Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!
Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.
Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.
Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.
Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.
And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.
Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegner, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Ahboltin, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.
I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grandchild, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills an important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupia
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Jackson Wong
Restauranteur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.  
VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby  
Henry M. Ortiz  
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment  
Supervisor Kevin Shelley  

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!  
BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.  
Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee  
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.  
John A. Ertola  
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.  
Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?  
Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!  
You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!!  
VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen  
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),  
S.F. Airport  
Art Rosenbaum  
Shirley Rosenbaum  
Ronald Page Lemmon  
Nada I. Lemmon  
Honor Bulkley  
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART into the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART into the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith  
Former BART President
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport? PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed "environmentalist" cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT'S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:
- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

• If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

• If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!

• If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chiu
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.

2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.

3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
PROPOSITION J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.
The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
ATM Area

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.
This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.
San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.
You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?
Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM's feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck's Office Supply

George Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any persons basic rights.

Vote Yes on "J"

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy. THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

- Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say's we would violate panhandler's civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who's civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven't been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need your yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President

Save Our Streets

Tenants and Merchants Assoc.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee
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If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn't Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn't Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City's approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won't solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you're sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn't reasonable or responsible. It's extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don't let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what's next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!
Proposition J wastes precious police resources. Laws already exist to protect ATM users.
Proposition J violates the First Amendment. You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.
Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
• chat with a friend,
• distribute flyers,
• sip coffee,
• hail a cab,
• gather petition signatures, or
• read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THEREOF PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of Francisco:

Section I. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public's safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
**PROPOSITION K**

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES  NO

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance. In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

**A “YES” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

**A “NO” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “K”**

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

---

**How “K” Got on the Ballot**

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

---

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeean
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansmer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

---

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Bragdon
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsum Digidgan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Hefner
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects.

The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer's Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don't know when, we don't know where, and we don't know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

I love animals are our friends.

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today. 1200 15th Street, S.F. (415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork produced by MasterType Polymer Services.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?  
Your return address:  

Germaine Q Wong  
San Francisco Registrar of Voters  
City Hall -- Room 158  
400 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA  94102-4691

Place 29¢ stamp here. Post Office will not deliver mail without postage.
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

Ballot Type
Peace and Freedom Party
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District
Precincts Applicable
3001 through 3944

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:

☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number __________________________ City ______________ State __________ Zip Code ______

Check below, if it is true for you:

☐ I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.
☐ My NEW address is printed below.
   (Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name Apartment Number __________________________

San Francisco, CA 94111

Zip Code

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version. I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish ___ Chinese ___

☐ You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

☐ The Date You Signed 
☐ Your Day Time Phone Number
☐ Your Evening Phone Number

To contact you if there is a problem with your application:

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

[Signature]

[Date]

[Your Day Time Phone Number]

[Your Evening Phone Number]
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Sites: San Francisco Unified Schools

Multiple Poll Workers: Walden House

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

**EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY**

**REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION**

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)**

**Your Signature**

**Print Your First Name**

**MI**

**Print Your Last Name**

**Print the Address Where You Live**

**Zip Code**

**Day Phone**

**Eve. Phone**

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:

I HAVE a car: ______ (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

**SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS**

Assigned Precinct: ____________________________  Home Precinct: ____________________________

Affidavit Number: ____________________________  Clerk: ____________________________  Inspector: ____________________________

E.O. Bk. 6/2  6/6  Code  Reg. Attached  Init'l.

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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**PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET**

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail);  
   11-30
2. the location of your polling place;  
   (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status;  
   back cover
4. Your rights as a voter;  
   8
5. information for disabled voters;  
   5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office;  
   32-33
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text;  
   37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and  
   36
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting.  
   inside back cover
28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.¹ Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."

2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.

3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.

4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.

5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.

6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

¹ Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATION DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs;
___ Lost use of both hands;
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the barcode on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT
To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING
If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative receives the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
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National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
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The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:

   - Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

   - Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

**STEP 1**

**USING BOTH HANDS**
**INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.**
Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动機将整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabezuelas rojas.

第二步
请确认将选票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二红點之上。

**STEP 3**

**HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把帶錐之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。
Find yourself a best friend.
We're open 7 days a week,
12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F
(415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and Artwork composed by Metatype Press San Francisco.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 451
LIBERTARIAN PARTY
8th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE
RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch
the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person’s name in
the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite
the number which corresponds to the word “YES” or “NO.”

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or
erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board
member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español
en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota. 中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
PASE A LA PAGINA
SEGUINTE
請翻到下頁開始投票

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

GOVERNOR

RICHARD RIDER
Stockbroker/Financial Planner
Corredor de bolsa/Planificador financiero 股票经纪／財務規劃員

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

BOB NEW
Businessman
Hombre de negocios 商人
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

2

SECRETARIO DE ESTADO
Secretary of State

PEGGY CHRISTENSEN
Technical Consultant
Asesora técnica 技術顧問

28

CONTROLADOR
Controller

CULLENE MARIE LANG

38

TESORERO
Treasurer

JON PETERSEN
Financial Systems Developer
Desarrollador de sistemas financieros 財務系統開發者

48
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>RICHARD N. BURNS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization, District 1</td>
<td>KENNITA WATSON</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Ballot**

**Consolidated Primary Election, June 7, 1994**

**City and County of San Francisco**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>RICHARD N. BURNS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization, District 1</td>
<td>KENNITA WATSON</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Richard Benjamin Boddie</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>Mark Valverde</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Vote por uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANTON SHERWOOD</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empleado de oficina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>高liner職員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**

Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本區没有人備案競選此職位
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DELAINE EASTIN</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS S. KEIZER</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRY L. MARTIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH D. CARRABINO</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILBERT SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAL RICE</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN G. DIMARCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A  EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program. YES 159  NO 160

1B  SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement. YES 163  NO 164

1C  HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead. YES 169  NO 170
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

159 SI 贊成
160 NO 反對

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1A

163 SI 贊成
164 NO 反對

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización para asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1B

169 SI 贊成
170 NO 反對

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán a la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparan trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias y prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

1C
8E

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters' credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons' access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
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185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反对

CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Emenda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no más de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 - 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

191 SI 贊成
192 NO 反对

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

198 SI 贊成
199 NO 反对

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD, ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazará las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).
178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
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**211 SI 贊成**
EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejura efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según lo define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

**212 NO 反對**

**218 SI 贊成**
ASESINATO; CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligirle daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

**219 NO 反對**

**224 SI 贊成**
LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

**225 NO 反對**

**178 180**

A  SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. 
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction
and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including
facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply
with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous
materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or
convenient for the foregoing purposes.

B  Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County
of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation,
the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed
the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the
purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equip-
ment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency
medical services?

C  Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment
without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the
limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

D  Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers,
with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?
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237 SI 贊成
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyan modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejores, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y dilución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

238 NO 反对

244 SI 贊成
¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sisenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

245 NO 反对

251 SI 贊成
¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

252 NO 反对

256 SI 贊成
¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?

257 NO 反对
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

E  Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?  YES 263  NO 264

F  Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?  YES 270  NO 271

G  Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?  YES 274  NO 275

H  Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?  YES 278  NO 279

I  Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?  YES 283  NO 284
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E

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abierta una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

F

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

G

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反對

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

H

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los Impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

I

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiere que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
SAMPLE BALLOT
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CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

   YES 289
   NO 290

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

   YES 295
   NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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289 SI 贊成 ¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

290 NO 反对 有人在使用自动提款机（ATM）存款时，如果有人在50米范围内抽烟或者超过一分钟，应否予以禁止?

295 SI 贊成 ¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

296 NO 反对 應否授權獲得州公共機構資助的私人組要在舊金山市、區發展、建築或購置廉租房，為低收入的人士和家庭，包括老年人或殘障人士，提供不超過3000個廉價庭

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACIÓN QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACIÓN; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dándalo no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SÍ" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知:

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他候選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你損壞、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，
請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor's office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2506 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynan, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorestein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothchild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirtas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Berman, 1529 Shrade St., Supervisor.
Carole Migdal, 1960 Hayes St, #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Leavin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Conn, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender’s office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Glorri, 135 Gardeside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Kenne, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Milgden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of
Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodolfo E. Rodl, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College
Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO’S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What Is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
**CHARTER** — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

**DECLARATION OF POLICY** — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

**GENERAL FUND** — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND** — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

**LEASE FINANCING** — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

**ORDINANCE** — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

**PRIMARY ELECTION** — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a **POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE** for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or re-construction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
School Bonds

PROPOSIENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of the Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City's economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSIENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: "As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools. "Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings..."

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O'Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O'Connell.

It's "politics as usual!". Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- "Contracting out" routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it's the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can't keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather "stick it" to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say "No" to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don't believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling "temporary" bungalows at the Richmond District's Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district's John O'Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be "stuck" with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
School Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

*Frank Jordan*
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting YES on A.

*Bay Area Women’s Resource Center*

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

*United Administrators of San Francisco*

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

*Carole Migden*
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote YES on Proposition A.

*G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO*
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicapped access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

*Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi*
*State Senator Milton Marks*
*Assemblyman Willie Brown*
*Assemblyman John Burton*

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscans community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea ... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

San Francisco Association of Realtors
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

Taxpayers deserve more accountability!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

*Eric Andresen*, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for "door rehabilitation." In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It's not the doors that need rehabilitating! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

*Tim Carrico*

President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children's Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O'Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as "temporary" and further alleges that their condition is "critical".

THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

*Linda De La Rosa*, Mission Resident & John O'Connell HS Parent

*Andrew L. Solow*, Member — Mayor's Mission Task Force

*Vicki Rega*, Mission Resident & John O'Connell HS Parent

*Alfred M. Lopez*, Mission Resident

*Ron Norlin*, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don't have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It's time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

*Merrier Turner Lightner*

Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts' priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco's prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can't make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECOGNIZING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREON; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated.

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds; $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots, used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein.

Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION

PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($23 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check? VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Irene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.
Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.
Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

YES □ NO □

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner  Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith  Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald  Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods  Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith  Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald  Democratic Central Committeeewoman
Ilene Hernandez  Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa  Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri  Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called “Equipment Lease-Financing” and other “funny-money” credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to “anticipate” local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of “credit card government” with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970’s was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit “games” to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more “funny-money” credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote “NO” on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote “NO” on Proposition C.

Also vote “NO” on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco's public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and "lease financing" plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco's current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren't prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don't let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It's our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City’s budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Bierman and Hallinan.
Police Staffing

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.

San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.

Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BE FooLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cops on the street.
Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.
Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.
I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.
Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.
Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. "CARPE DIEM."

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul Von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Nee Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delta
Sunset Resident
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.

Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.

This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.

When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.

I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.

The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Duggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.

To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.

In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.

Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.

We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.

Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Irene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.

We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.

Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!

Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hataayama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

Roberta Boomer
Donald A. Casper
Rose Chung
James E. Gilleran
Sam T. Harper
Harold Hoogastian
Jeannie "Jody" Stevens
Charles J. Wong

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote "Yes" on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to its full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
**PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D**

**DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS**

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994—1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? **Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.**

**VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!**

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges **Vote NO on D.** There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and **Vote No!**

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

**Vote No on D.**

Joel Ventresca

Budget and Policy Analyst

---

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D**

Jeff Brown

Public Defender
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

VOTE NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narc busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,791 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,791 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:
We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34650) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416 LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users’ preferences as to the facility’s operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.416 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992–93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How "E" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot. 42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:

- a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
- a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
- money for a respectable book budget;
- a library for the blind;
- the main library;
- much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government.

It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.

In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan

Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi

Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguer, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children—a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E—for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sebene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches—not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives—in every neighborhood—to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Potrero Branch
Richard Miller, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. **Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.**

Former Library Commissioners:
- Ed Bransten
- Raye Richardson
- Dale Carlson
- Jean Kalil
- Edward Callanan
- Steve Coulter
- Marjorie Stern
- Mary Louise Stone
- Virginia Gee
- Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. **Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.**

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open **without raising taxes.** That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — **Vote Yes on Prop E!**

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerta Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

**Vote Yes on E.**

Joel Ventesca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco’s branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!**

**Supervisor Bill Maher**

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful-new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn’t necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases. Please join me in voting **YES on E**.

**Carole Migden**

**Supervisor**

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We’re promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can’t they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

**Laura Lent**

**Blaine Waterman**

---

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children’s Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
**VOTE YES ON E**

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

**Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of “Reading Centers”, and Books, Books, Books: that’s what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that’s what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.**

**Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)**

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say **YES on Proposition E** and urge you to also vote **YES on E**.

**United Administrators of San Francisco**

San Francisco Tomorrow urges **Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.**

**San Francisco Tomorrow**
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Cothart

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/ Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorrwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Callum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The city's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A "closed" sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlotta del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Radel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

**Good government** ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! **Good government** means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. **Good government** works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

**Good government** does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! **Good government** does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

**Good Government** preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, **good government** is impossible without good libraries. **We support good government. We support Proposition E!**

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today's budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

**Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.**

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

**Supervisor Angela Alioto**
**Supervisor Kevin Shelley**
**Supervisor Susan Leal**
**Supervisor Bill Maher**
**BART Director Michael Bernick**

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Akhimsa Sumchay
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

* Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serum, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

* Vote NO on proposition E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straightjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

* Vote NO on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civilian service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.
PROPONEI'J'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City's $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES—PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City's high unemployment rate, why doesn't San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against "Freeloading"

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"!

Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!

The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised?

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!
Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say "No" to Proposition "F."

San Franciscans Against "Free-Loading"
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by *strike-out-type.*

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court of legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment. 8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates
The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:
(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program:
(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs:
(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimates:
(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay.
(e) Such other information as the Mayor or the Chief Administrative Officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget
Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:
(a) the overall mission and goals of the department
(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities
(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity
(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity
(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments
It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains
Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department’s programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City’s "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department’s performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department’s success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary.

Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood,” seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “BooHoo Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee of California Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President
Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!
Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.
What a joke!
The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".
Vote "NO" on "G"!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.
Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.
The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.
The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPORITION G

The City's budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need "Neighborhood-Based Budgeting!":

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn't.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government's wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs "reinventing" more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City's budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Airport BART Station

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the “most cost-effective, safest and most convenient” BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to “divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes” to fund this project. “Essential City programs” are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “H” Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

 Supervisor Carole Migden
 Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
 Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Oponent's Argument Against Proposition H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it's written so you'll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H's supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO's planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What's needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country's largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board's duty adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its "support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport". This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp's Good Government Committee

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition H

Senator Kopp's argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station "at the Airport", located "on Airport property."

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can't afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.
San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.
But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We’ve paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.
We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.
That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport.
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:
- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SanTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10–16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SanTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area's economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 - 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT'S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don't want a station that's going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let's help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco's transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city's history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!

San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user's nightmare.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!

A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city's General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities—such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago—that encourage efficient, direct public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don't allow the doom-sayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association  
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh's third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh's solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh's early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU'RE OUT!

If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn't deserve your support and shouldn't even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher—the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics—didn't have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp's BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It's motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Ailoto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco's greatest step for public transportation in the city's history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of boodle that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposal H is wasteful of your tax dollars.

It only makes sense that BART’s should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whisks of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Coras
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H. IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. I's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO —
VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO's brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCreary
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Position I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don't let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh's plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Dreifke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition I's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheelchair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE
EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT
SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of
transportation services by the San Francisco Bay
Area Rapid Transit District to and within San
Francisco International Airport, together with
provisions for funding thereof, and providing a
severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and
County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most
efficient, effective and economical means of
improving rapid transit services to and from the
San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is
by means of an extension of the rail service
provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid
Transit District (BART) to a passenger station
located within the Airport terminal area. Such an
extension will best serve the residents of both San
Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Air-
port workers, airline customers, tourists and per-
sons traveling between the Airport, San
Francisco and other Bay Area locations served
by BART. The people of the city and county find
and declare that the extension of such rapid tran-
sit services to a point within the Airport terminal
area is in the best interest of said city and county
and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that
the actual station location within the Airport ter-
minal area shall be one which attracts the most
passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city
and county that a BART passenger station be
constructed within the area of the Airport termi-
nals and that all necessary actions be taken by the
city and county to secure extension of BART rail
service directly into the Airport terminal area. To
implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of
 Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies,
including airport commissioners, with any
authority over any aspect of the extension of the
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
into the Airport shall adopt such further ordi-
nances and resolutions and take all other actions
as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of
BART service into the San Francisco Interna-
tional Airport terminal area as a part of BART
expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commis-
sion shall take all appropriate actions to generate
the revenue necessary to finance the BART
extension and station construction referred to
herein, which shall first include the utilization of
available Airport, regional, state and federal
funds, and may include the adoption of a passen-
ger facility charge as authorized by Section
1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States
Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized
passenger facility charge shall not exceed a
period of five years unless necessary to complete
the aforementioned construction and unless
extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of
Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility
charge may occur only if the airports commission
has applied for and secured federal authorization
to spend the revenue therefrom for the construc-
tion of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivi-
sion, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordin-
ance or any part thereof is for any reason held
unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court
of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not
affect the validity of effectiveness of the remain-
ing portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof.
It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each
section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph,
clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed
irrespective of the fact that any one or more other
sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs,
clauses or phrases had been declared unconsti-
tutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federal passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “I” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot. 9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
BART to the Airport

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers' money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 - $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending.

Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It's an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTIA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It's the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LETS MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION III!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part:

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

---

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what's right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let's do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

---

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don't be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City's general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City's general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City's general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

---

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I's opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don't be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Nev Valley Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Ammari Conway
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes! Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbegalata, Realtor
Anna Barbegalata, Realtor
Piut Lee, Realtor
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Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former "tightwad Supervisor," is no spendthrift. He's for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Ahbolin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Constock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchaj, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayet
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Dr. Evelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild's new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006. an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumber-some transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

For San Francisco and beyond... vote YES on Proposition I

THEK

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz
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Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills an important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City’s Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yesstad
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don’t fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restauranteur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!

VOTE YES I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future's course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let's choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.

John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don't have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn't!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART into the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART into the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP 1 IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP 1 is the answer. PROP 1 is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop 1's plan brings BART directly under the Airport's soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop 1 is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed "environmentalist" cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat's meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT'S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
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San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holzclaw, Sierra Club

(organizations listed for identification purposes only.)

Proposition "I" would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
- It costs more, but is less convenient.
- It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
- And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 - $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 - $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!
- If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 - $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.
1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.
The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh  
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Willie Brown  
Speaker, California State Assembly
Bill Maher  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES \[→\] NO \[→\]

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City's multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won't make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn't prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can't do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won't have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM's really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM's? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a "safety" zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM's. The Mayor's law seeks to play on the public's emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM's. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let's not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let's ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People who make legitimate use of ATMs feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Miller
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck's Office Supply

George Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person's basic rights.

Vote Yes on "J"

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say's we would violate panhandler's civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who's civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven't been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources. Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment. You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far. Before you believe the politicians' claims that it "won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens," read Proposition J and decide for yourself. This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially "off-limits" for ordinary citizens. New "no lingering" zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to "linger" in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that "can be conducted" outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

• chat with a friend,
• distribute flyers,
• sip coffee,
• hail a cab,
• gather petition signatures, or
• read a newspaper.

Defining the act of "lingering" to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely "lingering" or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to "move along." Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of "no lingering" zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be "in your face" at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote "NO" on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

**June 1, 2, and 3**

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES ⇨ NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How "K" Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994, the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Opponent's Argument Against Proposition K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project. In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition K

Proposition K will not increase anybody's tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don't be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor's Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers.
Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K
San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.
Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazeneave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutum Digigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be. Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

Find yourself a best friend.
We're open 7 days a week,
12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LOCAL PROPOSITIONS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?  Your return address:

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco,
California
Permit No. 2750
CAR-RT SORT

Ballot Type
451

Libertarian Party
8th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

Precincts Applicable
2001 through 2216
2701 through 2714
2901 through 2919

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number

City

State

Zip Code

Check below, if it is true for you:
☐ I have moved since the last time I registered to vote. My NEW address is printed below.
(Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an
absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained
on page 5.
☐ I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in:
Spanish ☐ Chinese ☐

All voters receive the English version.

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

The Date You Signed

Your Day Time Phone Number

Your Evening Phone Number

To contact you if there is a problem with your application:
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER
HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Multiple Sites | San Francisco Unified Schools | Multiple Poll Workers | Walden House |

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us.

Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr) Sign Here**

Print Your First Name  MI  Print Your Last Name

Print the Address Where You Live  Zip Code

Day Phone  --  Eve. Phone  --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:  I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

----------------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS -----------------------------

Assigned Precinct:  Home Precinct:  Clerk:  Inspector:

Affidavit Number:  Code  Reg. Attached  Init'l.

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA  94102
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### PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. A **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ........................................... 11-30
2. The **location of your polling place**; .................................................. 31
3. An application for an **Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent absentee voter status; ............................................. Back cover
4. Your **rights as a voter**; ..................................................... 8
5. **Information for disabled voters**; ............................................ 5
6. **Statements from candidates** who are running for local office; .................. 32-33
7. **Information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and  
against the measure, and the legal text; ........................................... 37-127
8. **Definitions of words you need to know**; and  
9. A **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting. ........................ inside back cover
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Page 3
28 April 1994

Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.¹ Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

¹ Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters' office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a "Permanent Absentee Voter" you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs;
___ Lost use of both hands;
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says "I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER" and sign your name where it says "Your SIGNATURE."

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a "P" then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may "fax" your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

"Cleaning" your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动機將整張選票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE Stub OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，按合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把带線之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉監票員。

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a la largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votacion.
RESPECT for ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE.  

D O N ' T Y O U T H I N K ?

Find yourself a best friend.  
We're open 7 days a week, 
12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Visit or call us today. 
1200 15th Street, S.F  
(415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee  Photos and Artwork composed by Macejeffy Petrant Services
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 453
LIBERTARIAN PARTY
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-in Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文說明印在選民手冊最後一頁的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.
Startup Voting, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1

GOBERNADOR
Governor

RICHARD RIDER
Stockbroker/Financial Planner
Corredor de bolsa/Planificador financiero 股票经纪人／財務規劃員

2

VICEGOBERNADOR
Lieutenant Governor

BOB NEW
Businessman
Hombre de negocios 商人

18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>PEGGY CHRISTENSEN</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>CULLENE MARIE LANG</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>JON PETERSEN</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General / Procurador General</td>
<td>RICHARD N. BURNS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENNITA WATSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>80</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **US SENATOR** | **SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS** | **United States Senator** | **RICHARD BENJAMIN BODDIE** | **Public Speaker**
|  |  |  |  | **Orador público 演講者**
| **JUNE 7, 1994** | **7 DE JUNIO DE 1994** |  |  |  |
| **JOE DONALDSON** |  |  |  |  |

| **JUNE 7, 1994** | **7 DE JUNIO DE 1994** |  |  |  |

| **US REPRESENTATIVE** | **REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 8** | **United States Representative, District 8** |
|  |  |  |
| **JUNE 7, 1994** | **7 DE JUNIO DE 1994** |  |  |  |

| **NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**
| **Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**
| **Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **STATE SENATOR** | **SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 3**
| **State Senator, District 3** |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**
| **No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**
| **No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito.**
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

STATE ASSEMBLY

MARK READ PICKENS
Researcher
Investigador

Member, State Assembly, District 13

106

COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

NO CANDIDATES Filed FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.
本區没有人備案競選此職位
## SAMPLE BALLOT
**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

### NONPARTISAN BALLOT
**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**

Mostly bilingual list with candidates for various positions, including:

- **SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA**
  - State Superintendent of Public Instruction
  - DAVID L. KILBER
  - CAROL S. KOPPEL
  - LEWIS S. KEIZER
  - PERRY L. MARTIN
  - FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE
  - JOSEPH D. CARRABINO
  - WILBERT SMITH
  - ROBERT 'ROB' STEWART
  - HAL RICE
  - GLORIA MATTIA TUCHMAN
  - MAUREEN G. DIMARCO
  - DELAIN EASTIN

- **ASSESOR**
  - DORIS M. WARD

- **DEFENSOR PUBLICO**
  - Public Defender
  - JEFF BROWN

Each candidate is followed by their position and a vote code (e.g., 135, 140).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

YES 159
NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

YES 163
NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California's economic vitality and to regain our state's high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state's economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

YES 169
NO 170
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1A

159 SI
160 NO

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO
Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la
emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares
($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa
de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1B

163 SI
164 NO

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta per-
mite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de
dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de
capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y
la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses
que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de
Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para
la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C

169 SI
170 NO

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES
DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad
económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas
de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por
un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000)
para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y uni-
versidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán
trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando
oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y
estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y uni-
versidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y
competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las
escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias
da prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán
alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a
una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en
las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y
proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los pro-
yectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias públicas
incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras
en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad,
actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerlos vigentes con
los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los
centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y
construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte
del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos
administrativos generales.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

8E
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters' credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons' access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 – 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

IMPOSIÇION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reembolsaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).
PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Approval Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Exclusion Tributaria del Impuesto sobre la Propiedad. Equipos para Conservación de Agua. Enmienda Constitucional Legislativa. Elimina la Constitución Estatal para Excluir del Impuesto sobre la Propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sofrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazará las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Asesinato: Castigo. Enmienda Legislativa por Iniciativa. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de inficlar daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Ley de Bonos para Terrenos de Parques, Sitios Históricos, Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y de los Bosques. Ley de Iniciativa. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mill millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A
**SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS.**
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

**VOTE:**  
- YES 237  
- NO 238

### B
Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

**VOTE:**  
- YES 244  
- NO 245

### C
Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

**VOTE:**  
- YES 251  
- NO 252

### D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

**VOTE:**  
- YES 256  
- NO 257
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A
237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para atender el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de daños materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

B
244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

C
251 SI 贊成
252 NO 反對

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

D
256 SI 贊成
257 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
E
Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

YES 263
NO 264

F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

YES 270
NO 271

G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES 274
NO 275

H
Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES 278
NO 279

I
Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES 283
NO 284
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263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores a aquellos del año fiscal 1993 - 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

E

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

F

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反對

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

G

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

H

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?

I

市政府現有項目的預算程序應否改為執行任務預算程序?

市政府現有項目的預算程序應否改為執行任務預算程序?

是否規定市政府對圖書館的撥款額，保持不低於1992-93財政年度的水平，並成立一圖書館保護金，每年從實業稅收中撥出一定數額存放在保護金中，這些保護金將用於增加圖書館服務；以及是否規定市政府對圖書館和26間分館的開放時間指定每週至少要若干小時？
J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES 289
NO 290

K
Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES 295
NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反對

J

Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se quedan dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

有人在使用自動提款機(ATM)提款時，如果有人在30呎內闖入散落超過一分鐘，應當予以禁止?

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反對

K

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

應否授權獲得知州公共機構資助的公私企業在舊金山市、縣發展、建築或購買低租金房屋，為低收入的個人和家庭，包括老年入或殘障人士提供數達3,000個廉租住屋單位?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
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INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:
SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título “Balota para un dandidato no listado.”

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras “SI” o “NO.”

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知：
請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空白上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你摳過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un dandiato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知：

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼“YES”或“NO”打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你撕過、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

請由第一頁開始投票。

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Malillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alloto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorestein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Rennie, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Berman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Wille B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenkin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Olive, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wal Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennesey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cheryl A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Pete G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mckins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAtter, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Rennie, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodol E. Rodta, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College
Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO’S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City's budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party's candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$95,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$6,356,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$152,356,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
PROFORM'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:
- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:
- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROFORM'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O'Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O'Connell.

It's “politics as usual”.

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:
- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- “Contracting out” routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anion Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
School Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Giraudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn't it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.

It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest effort to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! Taxpayers deserve more accountability! PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children's Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O'Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It's time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECIPTING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereon received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballot used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

______________________________

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party

Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

“LEASE FINANCING” EQUALS “MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY”!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE “CREATIVE” CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
Max Woods
Past Republican Committee
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a “pay as you go” basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents’ arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco's 911 problems can't be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

*Frank Jordan*
*Mayor*

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results. Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B. Please join me in voting YES on B.

*Cárole Migden*
*Supervisor*

As chair of the City's Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.

Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

*Supervisor Kevin Shelley*

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
PROPOSITION C
Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?  

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called “lease financing.” A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City’s debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter-approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible. We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money-saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party

Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices. Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco's public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and "lease financing" plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco's current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren't prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don't let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It's our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
Police Staffing

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES  NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.
San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.
Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.
We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.
Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.
Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.
Money for more police is available without increasing taxes. Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.
None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.
Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.
This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FOOLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!
If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.
Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.
As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neill Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.
Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.

This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!

The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes. The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salarino
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the “FULL FORCE FUNDING” initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support “FULL FORCE FUNDING” for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.
Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.
Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.
We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.
Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.
Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Nee Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.
Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.
I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.
Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.
We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.

Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Ammendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1,971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree. That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period.

That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary. The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Arthur Bruzzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

Robert Boomer
Donald A. Casper
Rose Chung
James E. Gilleran
Sam T. Harper
Harold Hoogastian
Joanne "Jody" Stevens
Charles J. Wong

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote “Yes” on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it's full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON’T HANDCUFF S.F.’S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city’s Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven’t our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year’s annual budget ordinance, last year’s budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn’t it already a “given” for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D! WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY’S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department’s budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• nars busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new, full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND

(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.

(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).

(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.

(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January, 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).

(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.

(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.

Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending funds monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.

(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.

(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.

(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992—93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992—93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994—95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994—95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994—95 and 2009—10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot
On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E IS ON PAGE 64.
E Library Fund

PROponent’s ArgUMENT in favor of proposition E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
- a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
- a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
- money for a respectable book budget;
- a library for the blind;
- the main library;
- much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

Rebuttal to Proponent’s ArgUMENT in favor of proposition E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government. It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million. In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police officers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children — a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sebene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: it guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Robert Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:

Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorber
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coli, Retired Librarian

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco's branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.
Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?
As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.
Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.
Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful main library never being fully stocked and staffed.
I wish Proposition E wasn't necessary. But it is.
Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.
Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.
San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We're promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can't they do anything right?
But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.
If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.
Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children's Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of "Reading Centers", and Books, Books, Books: that's what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that's what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.
Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.
These branches are an important tool in educating our youth. Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders. Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city's neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990's is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

 libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it's the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  Jeanna Haney
  Marie Plazewski
  Rev. Arnold Townsend
  Peter Gabel
  Vivian Wiley
  Alexa Smith
  Karen Fitzgerald
  Patrick Fitzgerald
  Eddie Chin
  Lulu Carter
  Leslie Katz
  Matthew Rothschild
  Natalie Berg
  Caitlin Curtin
  Claire Zvanski
  Maria Martinez
  Mike Bosia
  Mary Johnson
  Elaine Collins-McBride
  Ronald Colthirst
  Jim Rivaldo
  Al Baum
  Chuck Forester
  Tanya Neiman
  Tom Ammiano
  Lawrence Wong
  Leslie Katz
  Roberto Esteves
  Del Martin
  Phyllis Lyon
  Dorwin Buck Jones
  Jim Haas
  Bill Walker
  Tim Wolfred
  Mike Housh
  Rick Pacurar
  Matthew Rothschild
  Jim Hormel
  Ray Mulligan
  Mark Leno
  Kevin McCarthy
  Carole Cullum
  Ken Foote
  Robert Barnes
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wyns, SF Board of Education
Marla Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistreat volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hghts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Pussen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sunchai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
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Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committee Member
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Member
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Employment after Retirement


"F" IS FOR "FREE-LOADING"

Proposition “F” is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised?

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say "NO" to double-dipping!

Say "No" to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!

Say "No" to Proposition “F.”

San Franciscans Against “Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman


VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by *strike-out type*.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions, and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office, or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program.

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program.

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any item of the proposed estimate.

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay.

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

(a) the overall mission and goals of the department

(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals

(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department

(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities

(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity

(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity

(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans, and spending constraints identified in subsection (a) through (f) during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?  YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Re-inventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party

Arlie Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committeeman and Past BART Board President

Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Mission-Driven Budgeting

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!

Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.

What a joke!

The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".
Vote "NO" on "G"!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need "Neighborhood-Based Budgeting":

**BREAK IT DOWN**: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP**: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT**: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT**: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME**: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN**: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
*Peter Donohue, Ph.D.*, consulting economist
*Marc Norton*, community activist
*Joel Ventresca*, budget and policy analyst
*Calvin Welch*, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

*Carole Migden*
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting **YES on G**.

*Supervisor Kevin Shelley*

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Airpor BART Station

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES ➔

NO ➔

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

• Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
• Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
• Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE! VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it's written so you'll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H's supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO? Airports planners estimate that SFO's planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What's needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country's largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and L A Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board's duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its "support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport". This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp's argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station "at the Airport" located "on Airport property."

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can't afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.
San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.
But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We’ve paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.
We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.
That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electric, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10–16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and mostly will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service. Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 - 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST

STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco’s transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city’s history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user’s nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city’s General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don’t allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh’s third strike.
Strike one: Hsieh’s solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.
Strike two: Hsieh’s early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.
Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU’RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn’t deserve your support and shouldn’t even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn’t have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp’s BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It’s motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.
If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco’s greatest step for public transportation in the city’s history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!
If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half-baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self-serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.
It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?
Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. It’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.
Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. "YES" ON I AND "NO" on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ira Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly

Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janaan New
Raquel Pasco
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don't let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh's plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Proposition I's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Waverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SanTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SanTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(c), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof.

It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?  

YES  
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “I” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991. A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of “YES” votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.  
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition "I" is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition "I" does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
- All "surplus" funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
- San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on "I."

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition “I” station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100- $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition “I” requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition “I” station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

• Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
• Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
• Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
• Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition “I” because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent’s Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SPTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION II! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION II!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzeit, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the “BART trace” is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

---

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Feltzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I – Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It's vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport's $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART's own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let's be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn't been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don't let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let's move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural "trace" already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it's time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION II!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It’s sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don’t want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It’s just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco’s reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih’s Prop. I approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let’s Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O’Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don’t be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes! Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn’t in the airport and doesn’t meet the needs of today’s business travelers? Let’s do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.

Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Ahbolin, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. One thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grandchild, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have a great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their efforts to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpuz
Laurel E. Ayag
Noemi N. Sablad

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years.
BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport.
Any other alignment would be transit craziness.
- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport (“SFO”) is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City’s Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yetat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don’t fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. 1

Jackson Wong
Restauranteur
Glenn Tom
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club
Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition 1 is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition 1 provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Ratner, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future's course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let's choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.

John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don't have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn't!!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired), S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote "YES" on "I"!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
• The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport? If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:

It costs more, but is less convenient.

It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.

And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus

Donna Provenzano, President

Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 - $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

* If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take "all necessary actions" to build a $300 - $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

* If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn't financially feasible!

* If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn't as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren't cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 - $500 million — but they haven't figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they've mentioned several "potential" sources of funding, but it's ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren't owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won't cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn't the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can't afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don't have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.
1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.
3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.
The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly
Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot

On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J. This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J. San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable. You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandleings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM’s feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck’s Office Supply

Geroge Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd, Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

Vote Yes on “J”

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say’s we would violate panhandler’s civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who’s civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven’t been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.

Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.

You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violation shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on “K”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON'T HAVE TO "APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS."

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer's check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let's not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Woman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Man
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Briggs
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city's ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors
Low-Income Rental Housing

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects.
The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer's Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today, 1200 15th Street, S.F. (415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Supt of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCAL PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side? Your return address:

Place 29¢ stamp here. Post Office will not deliver mail without postage.

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall – Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you. The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

---

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION** - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election sign this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

**Check one below:**
- [ ] Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- [ ] I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

**Location:**
- P.O. Box or Street Number
- City
- State
- Zip Code

**Check below, if it is true for you:**
- [ ] I have moved since the last time I registered to vote. My NEW address is printed below. (Residence address ONLY.)

**Address:**
- Number and Street Name, Apartment Number
- SAN FRANCISCO, CA
- Zip Code

**Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name:**
- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish______, Chinese______
- [ ] All voters receive the English version.

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot. To contact you if there is a problem with your application:

**Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT**

**The Date You Signed**

**Your Day Time Phone Number**

**Your Evening Phone Number**
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
### POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Sites: San Francisco Unified Schools  
Multiple Poll Workers: Walden House

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

### EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

#### REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr):**  
**Sign Here:**  
**Your Signature**

**Print Your First Name:**  
**Print Your Last Name:**

**Print the Address Where You Live:**  
**Zip Code:**

**Day Phone:**  
**Eve. Phone:**

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:  

I HAVE a car:  

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

--- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---

**Assigned Precinct:**  
**Home Precinct:**

**Affidavit Number:**  
**Clerk:**  
**Inspector:**

**E.O. Bk.:**  
**6/2**  
**6/6**  
**Code**  
**Reg. Attached**  
**Init'I.'

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......................................................... 11-30
2. the location of your polling place; .................................................. (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .................................................. back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; .............................................................. 8
5. information for disabled voters; .................................................. 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .......................................................... 32-33
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .......................................................... 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and .................................. 36
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. .......................................................... inside back cover
Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9. Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters' office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a "Permanent Absentee Voter" you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs;
___ Lost use of both hands;
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says "I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER" and sign your name where it says "Your SIGNATURE."

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a "P" then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to our office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE

Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
  National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
  League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
  The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
  San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
  National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
  Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
  Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
  Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.
   If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
   • Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;
   OR
   • Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

Using las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

第一步
请双手将选票向自动投票机将选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请确认选票插入时，票尾之二孔，符合二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perforé con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把票上之选择柱，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把选票取出，沿虚線折起選票交給選舉站監選員。
RESPECT FOR ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE.
{ DON'T YOU THINK? }

Find yourself a best friend.
We're open 7 days a week,
12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F
(415) 554-6364.
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SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 461
GREEN PARTY
8th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word “YES” or “NO.”

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文说明印在选民手册最后一页的背面。

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**  
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

## 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNADOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **JAMES OGLE**  
Artist  
Artista 藝術工作者 |

| 2 |

## 4

| **JOHN T. SELAWSKY**  
Teacher/Writer  
Maestro/Escritor 教師／作者 |

| 4 |

## 6

| **JOHN LEWALLEN**  
Businessman  
Hombre de negocios 商人 |

| 6 |

## 8

| **NONE OF THE ABOVE**  
Ninguno de los anteriores |

| 8 |

## 18

| VICEGOBERNADOR  
-lient Governor |
|----------------|
| **DANIEL MOSES**  
Editor  
Editor 編輯 |

| 18 |

## 20

| **NONE OF THE ABOVE**  
Ninguno de los anteriores |

| 20 |
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

州務卿
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO
Secretary of State

MARGARET GARCIA
Writer/Editor
Escriitora/Editora

NONE OF THE ABOVE
Ninguno de los anteriores

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.

州計官
CONTRALOR
Controller

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.

司庫
TESORERO
Treasurer

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.</strong></td>
<td><strong>没有人備案競選此職位</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.</strong></td>
<td><strong>没有人備案競選此職位</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization, District 1</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
<td>講選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.</strong></td>
<td><strong>没有人備案競選此職位</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

## UNITED STATES SENATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARRABAR BLONG</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KENT W. SMITH</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONE OF THE ABOVE</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

**NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**

**Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.**

## STATE SENATOR

**NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**

**Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.**
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

STATE ASSEMBLY

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.
本區沒有人備案競選此職位

州議員，第十二區
MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12
Member, State Assembly, District 12

LUCY GOVORCHIN
Student
Estudiante 學生

MICHAEL MONNOT
Typesetter
Tipógrafo 植字員

ROBERT VON HOLDT
Publisher
Editor 出版人

BARBARA BLONG
Educator
Educatora 教育工作者

BETTY L. TRAYNOR
Small Business Owner
Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主

NONE OF THE ABOVE
Ninguno de los anteriores

Vote for One
投票一人

Vote for no more than 7
投票不超過七名

COUNTY COUNCIL

CONCILIO DEL CONDADO

111 →
113 →
115 →
117 →
119 →
121 →
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
BALOTA APARTIDARIA
無黨派選票

州教育廳長
SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

DELAINE EASTIN
Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleísta / 教師－女眾議員
135

DAVID L. KILBER
136

CAROL S. KOPPEL
Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官
137

LEWIS S. KEIZER
Educator / Educador / 教育工作者
138

PERRY L. MARTIN
Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師
139

FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE
Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師
140

JOSEPH D. CARRABINO
Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者－管理顧問
141

WILBERT SMITH
Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 商人、教育工作者
142

ROBERT "ROB" STEWART
Teacher / Maestro / 教師
143

HAL RICE
High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 高中教師
144

GLORIA MATTI TUCHAR
Teacher/School Trustee / Maestra/Síndico escolar / 教師／校董
145

MAUREEN G. DIMARCO
Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaría del Gabinete de Educación / 教育部長秘書
146

估稅官
ASSEOR
Assessor

DORIS M. WARD
Assessor
150

公共辯護律師
DEFENSOR PÚBLICO
Public Defender

JEFF BROWN
Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco 公共辯護律師
155
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A
EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.

YES 159
NO 160

1B
SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.

YES 163
NO 164

1C
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.

YES 169
NO 170
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1A

159 SI 贊成
160 NO 反對

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SÍSMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares ($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

F7

1B

163 SI 贊成
164 NO 反對

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta permite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar una inversión de capital para la construcción o mejora de las escuelas públicas y la autorización de asignar los fondos de los bonos y los intereses que surjan de los mismos de acuerdo con la Ley Estatal de Bonos para Asistencia de Edificación de Escuelas de 1952 para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas en la actualidad.

1C

169 SI 贊成
170 NO 反對

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventas de nuestro estado, este acta autoriza la emisión de bonos por un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en las escuelas universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los proyectos autorizados para las 136 ciudades universitarias públicas incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad, actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los centros de computación de las universidades y construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos administrativos generales.

1F
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER’S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

185 SI 贊成
CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 — 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

186 NO 反对

191 SI 贊成
IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exima a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles mediados por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

192 NO 反对

198 SI 贊成
EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD, ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

199 NO 反对

F8
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176

177
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178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Número</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211 SI</td>
<td>Exclusión tributaria del impuesto sobre la propiedad. Equipos para conservación de agua.</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 NO</td>
<td>Enmienda constitucional legislativa. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista en la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 SI</td>
<td>Asesinato: Castigo. Enmienda legislativa por iniciativa. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligirle daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 SI</td>
<td>Ley de bonos para terrenos de parques, sitios históricos, conservación de la vida silvestre y de los bosques. Ley de iniciativa. Autoriza la emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.</td>
<td>YES 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?</td>
<td>YES 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?</td>
<td>YES 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?</td>
<td>YES 256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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237 SI 贊成
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para aclarar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

238 NO 反對

244 SI 贊成
¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

245 NO 反對

251 SI 贊成
¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

252 NO 反對

256 SI 贊成
¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?

257 NO 反對

F10

amplesahl
| **E** Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week? | YES 263 | NO 264 |
| **F** Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? | YES 270 | NO 271 |
| **G** Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process? | YES 274 | NO 275 |
| **H** Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs? | YES 278 | NO 279 |
| **I** Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government? | YES 283 | NO 284 |
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263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que Aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga abierta una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反對

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione un sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
SAMPLE BALLOT
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J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES 289
NO 290

K
Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES 295
NO 296

END OF BALLOT
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J

← 289 SI 贊成
← 290 NO 反对

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se queden dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

有人在使用自動提款機(ATM)提款時，如果有人在50尺內閒遊數分鐘，應否予以禁止?

K

← 295 SI 贊成
← 296 NO 反对

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre ellas que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

應否授權獲得州公共機構資助的公私發展商在舊金山市、縣發展，建築或購買低租金房屋，為低收入的個人和家庭，包括老人或殘障人士提供數達5,000個廉租住屋單位?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título “Balota para un dandiado no listado.”

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras “SI” o “NO.”

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala a un miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

INSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH ARE ON THE FIRST BALLOT PAGE.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

TO START VOTING, TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.

請由第一頁開始投票。
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.
The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.
The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Allota, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shorenstein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliiritas St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumasero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lenvin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Oliffe, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrel, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 50 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardendale Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cheryl A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. McKinnis, III, 507 Los Palos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Milgden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodel E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Lung-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. ("Debt Service" is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or re-construction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, Improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco's commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Roofop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling "temporary" bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City's economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

"Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings...."

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O'Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O'Connell.

It's "politics as usual".

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- “Contracting out” routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPOSITION’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
School Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco’s most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women’s Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women’s Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators’ or teachers’ salaries. For the sake of our children’s future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco’s public schools cannot prepare our city’s children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings. By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco’s strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It’s simple enough: The city’s old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today’s youth and prepare tomorrow’s workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Graudo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote “NO” on Proposition A.
I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn’t it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.
It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.
Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A
If your car weren’t running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would.
And, that’s the fallacy of Proposition A.
It’s no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco’s schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.
Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.
Everyone can agree, San Francisco’s public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.
A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn’t working, it won’t get you anywhere.
Vote “NO” on Proposition A.

Proposition A is UNFAIR.
On its face, Proposition A is a good idea . . . the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.
Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.
Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don’t have to pay? Everyone’s quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn’t do that.
As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That’s why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we’ve shown it.
Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.
Isn’t it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn’t their priorities be increasing student’s test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco's current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn't provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can't just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children's money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans' money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! Taxpayers deserve more accountability! PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for "door rehabilitation." In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It's not the doors that need rehabilitating! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children's Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O'Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as "temporary" and further alleges that their condition is "critical". THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O'Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor's Mission Task Force
Vicki Leega, Mission Resident & John O'Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don't have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It's time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECEIVING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated.

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000, for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B
Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal and interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”
On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROPONEENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.
Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONEENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check? VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. *Measure B, disguised as lease financing*, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: *DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPOSITION'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents' arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

PROPOSITION C
Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "C"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your “YES” vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition “C” in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City’s equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation’s debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING “CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT” CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called “successful lease financing program” is really just over-priced San Francisco “credit card government” at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a “money saving program” is FRAUD on its face. We’re the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers’ money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve “the lowest possible cost” — VOTE “NO” ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE “NO” ON “FUNNY-MONEY” PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called “Equipment Lease-Financing” and other “funny-money” credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to “anticipate” local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of “credit card government” with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970’s was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit “games” to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more “funny-money” credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote “NO” on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote “NO” on Proposition C.

Also vote “NO” on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committee Member

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City’s ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 $40 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City's budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Bierman and Hallinan.
PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.

San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city's violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.

Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON'T BE FOOL! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks
Police Staffing

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kantum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: It puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level. They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.
Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.
Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.
Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.
I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.
Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.
Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.

Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gilien, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city.

Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to car-jacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco. Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force. This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment. When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.

I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172. The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.
In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtubs so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.

Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.

We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.

Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Irene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.

We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.

Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!

Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.
That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).
Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period. That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.
The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Jun Hatayama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

Robert Boomer
Donald A. Casper
Rose Chung
James E. Gilleran
Sam T. Harper
Harold Hoogasian
Joanne "Jody" Stevens
Charles J. Wong

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote "Yes" on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.
This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.
Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.
This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it's full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Paid Arguments Against Proposition D

Don't handcuff S.F.'s ability to respond to public safety concerns

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

Vote no on Prop D! We need flexibility to meet our city's needs; not ironclad earmarks hard to change!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote NO!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy. Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million price tag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
- clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
- police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
- police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
- narcotics busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
- jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
- cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
- vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
- police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
- police committing illegal searches and seizures?
Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The Board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416 LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND
(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.
(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users' preferences as to the facility's operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.
(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children's Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller's estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year's estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.
(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?  

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
- a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
- a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
- money for a respectable book budget;
- a library for the blind;
- the main library;
- much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E.
Put simply, it is bad government.
It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.
In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:
• Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police offers, OR
• Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
• Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
• Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks
Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.
But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.
If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.
Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPOENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.
Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.
Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.
In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.
Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.
Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment. It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguelo, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children—a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E—for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

Margarite Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Elizabeth VonKolnitz, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Sebene Selari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
Linnea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches—not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives—in every neighborhood—to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaboreyha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blausstein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Bovelander, Parkside Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Proper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Kalil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Rešnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade. Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco's branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn't necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We're promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can't they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children's Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of "Reading Centers", and Books, Books, Books: that's what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that's what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of "direct democracy." Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong  
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we're to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos  
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate  
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro  
Leonilda Ramirez, Don Ramons  
Theodore Seton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city’s neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990’s is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
   Jeanna Haney
   Marie Plazewski
   Rev. Arnold Townsend
   Peter Gabel
   Vivian Wiley
   Alexa Smith
   Karen Fitzgerald
   Patrick Fitzgerald
   Eddie Chin
   Lulu Carter
   Leslie Katz
   Matthew Rothschild
   Natalie Berg
   Caitlin Curtin
   Claire Zvanski
   Maria Martinez
   Mike Bosia
   Mary Johnson
   Elaine Collins-McBride
   Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it’s the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop. E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wulfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Callum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City’s library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A “Closed” sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract-out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We’re not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that’s needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It’s a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Michel Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hgts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchhai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people deposed the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hghts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn't have as many books, and librarians were banished.

"We want to go to the library!" the children cried. "Not today," replied the unhappy parents. "The library isn't open in the afternoon anymore."

The people protested, "This isn't fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn." The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

"No way," the king proclaimed. "I'll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I'll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I'll stop planting flowers in the park."

This made the children very sad. "Why is the king so mean?" they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines, or health centers, or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kapp
PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? 

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Employment after Retirement

PROPORIDENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City's $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City's high unemployment rate, why doesn't San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committee Member
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

“F” IS FOR “FREE-LOADING”!
Proposition “F” is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.
Proposition “F” would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.
What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!
But are you surprised?
This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.
Say “NO” to double-dipping!
Say “No” to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say “No” to Proposition “F.”

San Franciscans Against “Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.
The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.
To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.
Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.
What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?
Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.
Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government's labor costs.
Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.
Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.
Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.
Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION F (Continued)

made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent full-time employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(b)(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(b)(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program.

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs.

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate.

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay.

(e) Such other information as the Mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

(a) The overall mission and goals of the department

(b) The specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals

(c) The customer(s) or client(s) served by the department

(d) The service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department's programs and activities

(e) Strategic plans that guide each program or activity

(f) Productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans

(g) The total cost of carrying out each program or activity

(h) The extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G
Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a “line-item” budget. This “line-item” budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department’s programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City’s “line-item” budget and replace it with a “mission-driven” budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department’s performance in the year before.

The “mission-driven” budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department’s success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a “line-item” budget to a “mission-driven” budget.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book *Reinventing Government*, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boogie Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee of California Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President
Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!

Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.

What a joke!

The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".

Vote "NO" on "G"!

Citizens for Budget Sanity

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPOENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

YES ⇨ NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission’s Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How “H” Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
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PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn't be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn't be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn't deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let's make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!

VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition I's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!.

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LA Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best minimizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor
Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport. San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system. But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport. We've paid our fair share! Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services. Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible. Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner. Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger. It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station. It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction. It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.

Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.

We're sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.

This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.

That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.

As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.

Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travelers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:
- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electricized, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10–16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?
- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. H will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 - 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco's transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city's history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user's nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city's General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don't allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H

If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh's third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh's solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh's early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU'RE OUT!

If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn't deserve your support and shouldn't even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn't have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp's BART into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It's motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco's greatest step for public transportation in the city's history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars. It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self-serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.

It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H. IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Its plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.

Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO —

VOTE YES ON PROP. I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnston
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colin
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition 1 which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka
Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuelz N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government services;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to be best meet federal safety standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot. 9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSEN'TS ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco's reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport's $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport's operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF's General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of their car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn't be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport's expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let's seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It's the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION II!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSEN'TS ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition "P" is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 - 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition "P" does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 - $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All "surplus" funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco's Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1,4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn't right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn't guarantee City monies won't be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let's not blow it.

Vote NO on "P."

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition “I” station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 – $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition “I” requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition “I” station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

• Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
• Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
• Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
• Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition “I” because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending.

Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent’s Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of Improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LET’S MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Garaman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part:

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport.”

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I – Let’s do the right thing!!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strunsky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matta, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco.

We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I.

Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.

Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway.

Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.

And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Christine Abbolitin, Haas & Najarian – Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst – Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian – Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sumchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great-grandchild, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers.

Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco
Ernesto A. Pasco
Josie P. Corpus
Laurel E. Ayag
Neemi N. Sablad

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years.

BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.

- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.

- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz
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Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yeslat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restauranteur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club
Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile a away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Rainer, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ernola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada I. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART INTO the Airport. It's the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It's the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

David C. Spero
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

- The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.
- The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.
- The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.
- The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.
- A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:
- BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.
- If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.
BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport? If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
- It costs more, but is less convenient.
- It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
- And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shimko, Political Action Chair
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San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 - $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can't afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take "all necessary actions" to build a $300 - $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

- If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn't financially feasible!

- If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn't as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren't cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN'T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 - $500 million — but they haven't figured out who's going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they've mentioned several "potential" sources of funding, but it's ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren't owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won't cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I is not the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can't afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don't have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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Don’t be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.

2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.

3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION J

Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.
This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlers must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM's feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association
Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck's Office Supply
George Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.
Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person's basic rights.

Vote Yes on "J"

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors
Connie Ramirez Webber
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors
Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.
THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.
Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition say's we would violate panhandler's civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.
Who's civil rights are being violated?
We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!
If you haven't been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program.

Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state!

Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.

Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.

You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition J goes too far. 
Before you believe the politicians’ claims that it “won’t make criminals out of law-abiding citizens,” read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially “off-limits” for ordinary citizens. New “no lingering” zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to “linger” in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that “can be conducted” outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:

• chat with a friend,
• distribute flyers,
• sip coffee,
• hail a cab,
• gather petition signatures, or
• read a newspaper.

Defining the act of “lingering” to be a crime just won’t work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely “lingering” or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to “move along.” Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of “no lingering” zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be “in your face” at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote “NO” on J.

Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It’s the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121

THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines impair the public's safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person's basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person's permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON'T HAVE TO "APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS."

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer's check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let's not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committee man of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee man

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bier man
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Low-Income Rental Housing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigade
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yutum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Vote YES on Proposition K

San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects.

The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer’s Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
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AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
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Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.
Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.
Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
## INDEX

### GENERAL INFORMATION
- Absentee Ballot Application ........................................... Back Cover
- Access for the Disabled Voter ........................................ 5
- Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures ...................... 35
- City and County of San Francisco Offices to Be Voted on This Election ........................................... 31
- How to Use Poll Star Vote Recorder ................................ 9
- Important Facts About Absentee Voting ............................. 6
- Location of Your Polling Place ....................................... Back Cover
- Permanent Absentee Voter Application ............................ Back Cover
- Permanent Absentee Voter (Permanent Vote-by-Mail) Qualifications .................................................. 5
- Poll Worker Application .............................................. Inside Front Cover
- Polling Place Card ................................................... Inside Back Cover
- Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet ..................... 3
- Sample Ballot ......................................................... 11-30
- Telephoning the Registrar of Voters ............................... 129
- Words You Need to Know .......................................... 36
- Your Rights as a Voter ............................................. 8

### CANDIDATE STATEMENTS
- Assessor
  - Doris M. Ward ......................................................... 32
- Public Defender
  - Jeff Brown .......................................................... 33

### PROPOSITIONS
- Airport BART Station ................................................... 87
- ATM Area ............................................................................... 115
- BART to the Airport ...................................................... 99
- Employment after Retirement ......................................... 77
- Equipment Lease Financing Limit ..................................... 51
- Library Fund ....................................................................... 65
- Low-Income Rental Housing ............................................. 123
- Mission-Driven Budgeting ............................................... 83
- Police Staffing .................................................................. 55
- Proposition A ....................................................................... 37
- Proposition B ....................................................................... 47
- Proposition C ....................................................................... 51
- Proposition D ....................................................................... 55
- Proposition E ....................................................................... 65
- Proposition F ....................................................................... 77
- Proposition G ....................................................................... 83
- Proposition H ....................................................................... 87
- Proposition I ....................................................................... 99
- Proposition J ..................................................................... 115
- Proposition K ..................................................................... 123
- School Bonds ...................................................................... 37
- 911 Dispatch Center Financing ......................................... 47

---

**SAN FRANCISCO VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET — CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION 1994**

Published by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
City and County of San Francisco
400 Van Ness Avenue, Room 158
San Francisco, CA 94102
Gregory P. Ridenour, Administrative Manager

Typesetting by ImageInk
Andrea Fox, Graphic Production Artist
Printing by V Q S Enterprises
Translations by La Raza Translation Service and Chinese Journal Corp.
Cover Design by S. Chris Ahn

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet is printed on recycled paper.
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

Ballot Type

461

Green Party
8th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

Precincts Applicable
2001 through 2216
2701 through 2714
2901 through 2919

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
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GERMAINE Q WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
### POLLING PLACE / POLL WORKER HONOR ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiomco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco Unified Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Poll Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walden House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

### EQUAL CIVIC DUTY OPPORTUNITY - SIGN UP TODAY

### REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)</th>
<th>Your Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Your First Name</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Print Your Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print the Address Where You Live</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Phone</th>
<th>Eve. Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

--- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Precinct:</th>
<th>Home Precinct:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affidavit Number:</th>
<th>Clerk:</th>
<th>Inspector:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.O. Bk.</th>
<th>6/2</th>
<th>6/6</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reg. Attached</th>
<th>Init'l.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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# PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......................... 11-30
2. the location of your polling place; .......................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .......................... back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ........................................... 8
5. information for disabled voters; .................................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .................................... 32-33
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................................... 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and .................................... 36
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. .................................... inside back cover
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Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WON'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.1 Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

---

1 Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters’ office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a "Permanent Absentee Voter" you must have at least one of the following conditions:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs;
___ Lost use of both hands;
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says "I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER" and sign your name where it says "Your SIGNATURE."

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a "P" then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).

Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas De Luca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares: a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.
Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS
The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures. If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE: IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando los dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步 須要手持選票向自動機將整個選票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步 請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步 请持選票之選舉針，由票卡內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a la altura de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步 投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。
Respect for Animals Should Be Human Nature.

{Don't you think?}

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F
(415) 554-6364.

Created by the San Francisco Ad Club Public Service Advertising Committee. Photos and artwork composed by Monotype Propers Services.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 462
GREEN PARTY
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文说明印在选民手册最后一页的背面。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
PASE A LA PAGINA SEGUENTE

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
## SAMPLE BALLOT

### CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994

### CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>GOBERNADOR</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JAMES OGLE</td>
<td>Artist, Artista</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN T. SELAWSKY</td>
<td>Teacher/Writer, Maestro/Escritor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN LEWALLEN</td>
<td>Businessman, Hombre de negocios</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONE OF THE ABOVE</td>
<td>Ninguno de los anteriores</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR</th>
<th>Lieutenant Governor</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DANIEL MOSES</td>
<td>Editor, Editor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONE OF THE ABOVE</td>
<td>Ninguno de los anteriores</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MARGARET GARCIA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE.**
Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.
没有人備案競選此職位
## SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROCURADOR GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>政府保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO DE COMPENSACION, DISTRITO 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization, District 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>政府保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>政府保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>政府保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>政府保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>政府保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>政府保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>政府保险委员会膜</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

### US SENATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARBARA BLONG</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educadora 教育工作者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KENT W. SMITH</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator/Business Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educador/Asesor comercial 教育工作者／商業顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONE OF THE ABOVE</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninguno de los anteriores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### US REPRESENTATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONE OF THE ABOVE</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninguno de los anteriores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATE SENATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONE OF THE ABOVE</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninguno de los anteriores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.**

Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.

本區没有人僱案競選此職位
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

STATE ASSEMBLY
MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12
Member, State Assembly, District 12

NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.
 Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本區没有人備案競選此職位

STATE ASSEMBLY
LUCY GOVORCHIN
Student
Estudiante 學生

MICHAEL MONNOT
Typesetter
Tipógrafo 植字員

ROBERT VON HOLDT
Publisher
Editor 出版人

BARBARA BLONG
Educator
Educadora 教育工作者

BETTY L. TRAYNOR
Small Business Owner
Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主

NONE OF THE ABOVE
Ninguno de los anteriores

111 →
113 →
115 →
117 →
119 →
121 →
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

## NONPARTISAN BALLOT
**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**

### State Superintendent of Public Instruction
- **DELAINE EASTIN**
  - Teacher-Assemblywoman / Maestra-Asambleista / 教師－女衆議員
- **DAVID L. KILBER**
- **CAROL S. KOPPEL**
  - Retired Judge / Juez jubilado / 退休法官
- **LEWIS S. KEIZER**
  - Educator / Educador / 教育工作者
- **PERRY L. MARTIN**
  - Engineer / Ingeniero / 工程師
- **FRANK JOSEPH ANTHONY MELE**
  - Research Engineer / Ingeniero de investigaciones / 研究工程師
- **JOSEPH D. CARRABINO**
  - Educator-Management Consultant / Educador - Asesor de administración / 教育工作者－管理顧問
- **WILBERT SMITH**
  - Businessman, Educator / Hombre de negocios, Educador / 商人－教育工作者
- **ROBERT "ROB" STEWART**
  - Teacher / Maestro / 教師
- **HAL RICE**
  - High School Teacher / Maestro de escuela secundaria / 英中教師
- **GLORIA MATTA TUCHMAN**
  - Teacher/School Trustee / Maestra/Síndico escolar / 教師／校董
- **MAUREEN G. DIMARCO**
  - Education Cabinet Secretary / Secretaria del Gabinete de Educación / 教育內閣秘書

### Assessor
- **DORIS M. WARD**
  - Assessor / Asesor / 估税官

### Public Defender
- **JEFF BROWN**
  - Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco / Defensor Público, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco / 公共辯護律師
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A EARTHQUAKE RELIEF AND SEISMIC RETROFIT BOND ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program. YES 159 NO 160

1B SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement. YES 163 NO 164

1C HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead. YES 169 NO 170
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO
Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS. Este acta permite la
emisión de bonos por un valor de dos mil millones de dólares
($2,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa
de retroajuste sísmico y alivio en caso de terremotos.

1A

ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS. Este acta per-
mite una emisión de bonos por un valor de mil millones de
dólares ($1,000,000,000) para fortalecer, mejorar y construir
escuelas terciarias y universidades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán
trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando
oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y
estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y uni-
versidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y
competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las
escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias
a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán
alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a
una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en
las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y
proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los pro-
yectos autorizados para las 130 ciudades universitarias públicas
incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en
caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad,
actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con
los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los
centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y
construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte
del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos
administrativos generales.

1B

ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES
DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR. Para renovar la vitalidad
económica de California y recuperar la alta calidad de ventajas
de nuestra estado, este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por
un valor de novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para
fortalecer, mejorar y construir escuelas terciarias y universi-
dades públicas en todo el estado. Estos proyectos crearán
trabajos y fortalecerán la economía del estado, proporcionando
oportunidades de capacitación laboral para adultos y
estudiantes y permitiendo que las escuelas terciarias y uni-
versidades públicas preparen trabajadores bien capacitados y
competitivos. Repararán y reconstruirán las aulas de las
escuelas terciarias, lo que fortalecerá las ciudades universitarias
a prevenir daños en caso de futuros terremotos. Proporcionarán
alternativas al crimen y a las pandillas al asegurar el acceso a
una educación superior. Mejorarán la calidad del aprendizaje en
las ciudades universitarias públicas, mejorando las aulas y
proporcionando modernas tecnologías de enseñanza. Los pro-
yectos autorizados para las 130 ciudades universitarias públicas
incluyen, pero no están necesariamente limitados a, mejoras en
caso de terremotos y otras mejoras de salud y seguridad,
actualización de los laboratorios para mantenerse vigentes con
los adelantos científicos, mejoras y modernización de los
centros de computación de las ciudades universitarias y
construcción de aulas y bibliotecas. No se gastará ninguna parte
del dinero que provenga de la venta de los bonos para gastos
administrativos generales.

1C
### 175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters' credit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES 185</th>
<th>NO 186</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES 191</th>
<th>NO 192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS' ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons' access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES 198</th>
<th>NO 199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

EdN
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CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
185 NO 反對

CREDITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de $100 millones en 1995 – 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario de los inquilinos.

186 NO 反對

175

191 SI 贊成
192 NO 反對

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Exima a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

176

198 SI 贊成
199 NO 反對

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.
Permítase que la Legislatura elimine del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

177

無黨派選票 F8

舊金山市、縣 聯合初選 一九九四年六月七日 提交選民投票表決的州提案

物業稅免稅。保障住民通路。立法修正案。容許立法議會免除建築物的物業稅，如果該建築物的建造、增建、修去，或改裝現存的全部或部份是要使殘疾人士容易進出，或容易使用。財政影響：數年後的地方政府在物業稅的損失每年將達1千萬元左右，校區的損失（大約是全部的半天）將由州政府彌補。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

9E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反對

EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excluir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobernantes locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對

ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infligirle daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

224 SI 贊成
225 NO 反對

LEY DE BONOS PARA TERREÑOS DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTÓRICOS, CONSERVACIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3.6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1.6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.

F9 無黨派票
A  SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

B  Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

C  Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

D  Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

F10

237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

251 SI 贊成
252 NO 反對

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

256 SI 贊成
257 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
### E
**Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?**

**YES 263**

**NO 264**

### F
**Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?**

**YES 270**

**NO 271**

### G
**Shall the City’s current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?**

**YES 274**

**NO 275**

### H
**Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?**

**YES 278**

**NO 279**

### I
**Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?**

**YES 283**

**NO 284**
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abiertas una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反对

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反对

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

12E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  YES 289  NO 290

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?  YES 295  NO 296

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

289 SI 贊成
290 NO 反對

¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se quedan dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina?

有人在使用自動提款機(ATM)提款時，如果有人在30尺內閒遊敎
請超逾一分鐘，應否予以禁止?

295 SI 贊成
296 NO 反對

¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas?

應否授權獲得州公共機構資助的
公私發起人在舊金山市、縣發
展、建築或購買低租房屋，為低
收入的個人和家庭，包括老年人
或殘障人士提供數逾3,000個廉租
住房單位？

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título “Balota para un danditado no listado.”

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfure la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras “SI” o “NO.”

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

Instrucciones en English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
ASSESSOR

The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.

The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.

The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

____________________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alloto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.

Douglas Shorestein, 2650 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.

Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.

Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.

Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.

Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Minister.

Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.

Carole Mdgen, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.

Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.

Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chamarro Blvd. #5E, Supervisor.

Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Annemarie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Nancy Leavin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.

Cordell Olave, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.

Tina Burgess Conn, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.

Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.

Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.

Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

32
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender’s office have worked timelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Giorgi, 135 Gardeside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstern, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmas Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteeer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodolfo E. Rodis, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO’S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling “bonds” to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a “Yes” vote means, and what a “No” vote means. There is a statement by the City’s Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttals arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City’s budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or re-construction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$95,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$56,356,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$152,356,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:
- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Roof top Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School.
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:
- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings....”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:
- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? **Vote NO on Proposition A.**

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
School Bonds

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it’s the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can’t keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather “stick it” to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say “No” to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don’t believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District’s Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district’s John O’Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be “stuck” with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco's most valuable resource is its children. They need a quality education in order to compete in the new world economy. Unfortunately, the schools are falling apart. Leaking roofs, rotting floors, non-working bathrooms, exposed asbestos, poor wiring, and terrible lighting interfere with quality education. Our children deserve better. Proposition A will fund desperately needed repairs. These repairs are an investment in our future. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

The Tenderloin is the only San Francisco neighborhood with no public schools. By supporting Proposition A, you will be helping to establish a much-needed elementary school in the Tenderloin. You will also be voting for the upgrade and repair of nearly all of our public schools.

The Bay Area Women's Resource Center has been actively working, along with neighborhood parents, for over two years towards the dream of establishing a school for our 4,000 Tenderloin children. Please help us by voting Yes on A.

Bay Area Women's Resource Center

The students of San Francisco need quality education in safe schools. Proposition A will allow the school district to renovate schools in every neighborhood in the city.

The proceeds from the Proposition A Bond will provide safe, state of the art schools throughout the district. None of the proceeds will be used to pay for administrators' or teachers' salaries. For the sake of our children's future, we urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco's public schools cannot prepare our city's children for the future with outdated equipment and dilapidated buildings.

By building public schools that we can be proud of, Proposition A will build the spirit of pride in our young people.

Please join me in voting YES on A.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

There may be no single issue that is more important to the community and to business than the education of our young people. The quality of public education is directly related to the quality of our lives and the health of the economy.

Business relies on well-educated employees and, in fact, one of San Francisco's strongest selling points is the excellence of our work force. If we are to continue to be competitive, we must provide excellent education for our children.

Our public schools serve multiple purposes, from providing a learning environment for our youth to serving as after-hours recreation centers and providing emergency shelter in the event of a disaster. How much we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for and value the programs within those buildings. Without safe, functioning schools, we cannot provide decent education to our young people.

We cannot let our public schools continue to deteriorate. While the Chamber of Commerce continues to be concerned with bond measures that are unfairly levied solely against property owners, we support Proposition A. It's simple enough: The city's old school buildings need to be repaired and upgraded if we are to educate today's youth and prepare tomorrow's workers. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PROPOSITION A will provide funds to improve the safety of our school age children, upgrade critical learning facilities, like libraries, science and computer laboratories and replace leaky roofs, outdated bathroom, heating and ventilation systems and provide handicap access as required by law. Proposition A will allow the School District to build a new school in the Tenderloin, a School for the Arts and new facilities in the Richmond, Mission and Sunset districts. Please vote yes on Proposition A.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
State Senator Milton Marks
Assemblyman Willie Brown
Assemblyman John Burton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on PROPOSITION A, a $95 million bond initiative, which will be used to repair virtually every school in the City and build 6 new schools in the Richmond, Sunset, Mission, Twin Peaks and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The Unified School District has a clear plan for the expenditure of these funds and has built in cost controls for spending these bond proceeds. Help build our kid’s future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Leland Yee
President, San Francisco School Board

The San Francisco Democratic Party is committed to improving our children’s educational opportunities. We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A.

Supervisor Carol Migden
Chair, Democratic County Central Committee

Children are the infrastructure of our society and education is its foundation. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

With only emergency maintenance over the last ten years, virtually every school in the City has essential safety and maintenance needs that can only be made if Proposition A passes. For the sake of our school age children and all San Franciscans who use the schools, we urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith
Assessor Doris Ward
City Attorney Louise Renne

Our City’s economic future and quality of life are dependent on educating our youth. How we care for our school buildings is a sign of how much we care for the education that takes place in those buildings. Proposition A will allow the School District to make repairs in virtually every school in the City. Proposition A makes good sense for all San Franciscans. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Lou Gerardo

Top priority must go to schools. Violence is up, demographics are shifting. Instead of locking people up, we must create an environment where young minds are given the opportunity to capture their future. Parents in the Tenderloin need a neighborhood school in order to participate in their children’s education. Promises must be kept to replace antiquated bungalows with new classrooms. The School Board designated 135 Van Ness for the new Arts High School — a site where we can all participate in building a nationally recognized school.

Ruth Asawa
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn't it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Euteneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren't running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would.

And, that's the fallacy of Proposition A.

It's no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco's schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of $99 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco's public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn't working, it won't get you anywhere.

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea... the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don't have to pay? Everyone's quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn't do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That's why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved a $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we've shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn't it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn't their priorities be increasing student's test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
School Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes! Taxpayers deserve more accountability!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating! San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions.

It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Calling Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, TO PAY INTEREST ON THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/or COMPLETION OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/or COMPLETION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IS AND WILL BE GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY, RECEIVING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION, FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purpose stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

The estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes theretoe received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be held and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election is hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If and to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein.

Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($2.3 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"
On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 46.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Irene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents' arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results. Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B. Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B. Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION C
Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?  

YES  NO

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER???

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
   Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
   Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
   Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
   Past Republican Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
   Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
   Democratic Central Committeewoman
Irene Hernandez
   Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
   Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
   Republican Central Committeeman
Equipment Lease Financing Limit

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco’s public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco’s current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren’t prepared to have this debt doubled by the propagation of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A PROPOSAL TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY BY AMENDING SECTION 7.309 THEREOF RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20,000,000, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?  YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City’s budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Bierman and Hallinan.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Police Staffing

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes
San Franciscans don’t feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. Our city’s violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.
Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes. Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers! Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That’s only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

DON’T BE FOOLED! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D!
If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money’s worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City’s general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don’t kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

Esther Marks

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

O P P O S I T I O N  T O  P R O P O S I T I O N  D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let's give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Ina Dearman
Nan McGuire
David Looman
Sara Simmons

T o n y  K i l r o y
P a m e l a  A y o  Y e t u n d e
J e a n  K o r t u m
M i c h a e l  N o l a n
E i l e e n  C o l l i n s
N e i l  G e n d e l
E s t h e r  M a r k s
D a n  D i l l o n
S u e  B i e r m a n


Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: It puts more police on our streets.

By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Let's set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.

This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.

Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.

Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!

The San Francisco Police Officers' Association supports "Citizens for Safer Streets" in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.

Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.

I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

---

A fully staffers police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.

Proposition D won't raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.

Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

---

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.

The "prime" responsibility of Government is to "protect" its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it's a priority.

Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

---

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.

Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.

This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.

This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.

The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.

We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

---

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.

San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.

We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims

Cristine Mack
Member

Helga D'Arcy
Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the "FULL FORCE FUNDING" initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support "FULL FORCE FUNDING" for San Francisco. Let's make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let's make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realtor, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets.
Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.
Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.
We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.
Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.
Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noe Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.
Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident
Police Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.

Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.

This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.

When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.

I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.

The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.

Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.

To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

For too long the Police Department has been understaffed. For too long, criminals have been getting away with murder on our streets.

In some neighborhoods, parents make their children sleep in bathtub so they won’t get shot. Merchants are easy targets for brazen criminals undeterred by broad daylight or crowded sidewalks.

Everyone talks about making our streets safer. Now we can actually do something about it. Proposition D will put 200 more police officers on our streets where we need them most.

We’re tired of rhetoric and excuses. We need a community-based police force working to prevent crime instead of pursuing criminals after we’ve been hurt. Proposition D will make that happen.

Vote YES on Prop. D so we can be safe in our own city again.

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.

We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.

Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!

Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree. That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period. That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Arthur Bruzzone
Christopher L. Bowman
Albert Chang
Lee Dolson
Anna M. Guth
Joy Hatoyama
John Sidline
Marc Wolin
Lee B. Vanderveld

Robert Roemer
Donald A. Casper
Rose Chung
James E. Gilleran
Sam T. Harper
Harold Hoogasian
Joanne "Jody" Stevens
Charles J. Wong

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote "Yes" on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee
Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety. This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere. Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee that these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to its full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANDCUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D: WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy.

Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irreducible, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.

Proposition D will waste $15 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
- clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
- police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
- police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
- narc busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
- jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
- cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
- vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
- police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
- police committing illegal searches and seizures?

Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilianize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:

San Francisco Charter Section 6.416 LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND
(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.
(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users’ preferences as to the facility’s operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.
Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending funds in accordance with this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.
(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.
(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations may be rectified by the Controller in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.
(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 – 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992–93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994–95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994–95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994–95 and 2009–10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How “E” Got on the Ballot
On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROPOSI TON'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government's priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:

• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco's Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSI TON'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E. Put simply, it is bad government.

It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the libraries' budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.

In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase translates into:

- Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans to hire 100 new police offers, OR
- Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all night bus service, OR
- Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimination of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital, OR
- Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recreation and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks

Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase service. That is a commitment I will keep.

But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.

If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budgetary chaos of unprecedented proportions.

Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200 million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a thing or two to learn about “good government”.

Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you'll keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient funding for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.

Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over $1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now open only 34, others, just 18.

In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,000 voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.

Empty rhetoric won't work, the library budget is headed in the wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better management. The sky won't fall if Proposition E passes. It's unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.

Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco's Public Libraries
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

Al Triguero, President SF Police Officers Association
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: It guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
Larry Ware, Miriam Pavis, Bayview Branch
Ellen Egbert, Lisa Kaborycha, Bernal Heights Branch
Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
Carol Adee, Karen Boveland, Parksidge Branch
Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
Roberta Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
Ellia Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we’ve witnessed the devastation of San Francisco’s library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city’s budget wars. Reduced and inaccessible hours, meager book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city’s branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city’s annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco’s future. Let’s not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco’s libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
Ed Bransten
Raye Richardson
Dale Carlson
Jean Katil
Edward Callanan
Steve Coulter
Marjorie Stern
Mary Louise Stong
Virginia Gee
Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city’s most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident’s Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade.

Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.

Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco's branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth. Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Supervisor Bill Maher

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn't necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting YES on E.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We're promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can't they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

Laura Lent
Blaine Waterman

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children's Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
VOTE YES ON E

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of "Reading Centers", and Books, Books, Books: that's what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that's what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote YES on E.

United Administrators of San Francisco

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on E. Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor’s position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of “direct democracy.” Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we’re to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco’s public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City’s budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City’s future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city’s economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city's neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990's is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
  - Jeanna Haney
  - Marie Plazewski
  - Rev. Arnold Townsend
  - Peter Gabel
  - Vivian Wiley
  - Alexa Smith
  - Karen Fitzgerald
  - Patrick Fitzgerald
  - Eddie Chin
  - Lulu Carter
  - Leslie Katz
  - Matthew Rothschild
  - Natalie Berg
  - Caitlin Currin
  - Claire Zvanski
  - Maria Martinez
  - Mike Bostia
  - Mary Johnson
  - Elaine Collins-McBride
  - Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it's the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A "Closed" sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlotta del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monei, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city's neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We're not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today's budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that's needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It's a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society—a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away.

PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city’s annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what’s important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City’s last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we’re to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco’s unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifti, President, Diamond Hghts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O’Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City’s 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children’s education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn: Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sinhachai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanier
Ronald Colthirst
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Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They deposed the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F

Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?  

YES  

NO  

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Employment after Retirement

**PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F**

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

**REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F**

**SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPO-
RARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.**

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money.

Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.**

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”

Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committeeman

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman

Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Arto Hale Smith
Past President BART Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

"F” IS FOR “FREE-LOADING”!

Proposition "F" is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.

Proposition "F" would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.

What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!

But are you surprised!

This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.

Say “NO” to double-dipping!
Say “No” to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say “No” to Proposition “F.”

San Franciscans Against “Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.

The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.

To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.

Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.

What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?

Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.

Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government’s labor costs.

Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid.

Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need.

Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall.

Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.540 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(I) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 60 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be (Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of the City and County before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:
(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;
(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work programs;
(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;
(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;
(e) Such other information as the Mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 – 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 – 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:
(a) the overall mission and goals of the department
(b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals
(c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department
(d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities
(e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity
(f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans
(g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity
(h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its mission goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2.

Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Goals

Within thirty days of the Controller's issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services. The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary.

Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

———

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book Reinventing Government, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruef, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shmitz, or their “Boo! powstał”’s of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE "NO" ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committeeman and Past BART Board President
Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” IS FOR “GOUGING”!

Proposition “G” is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control.

What a joke!
The change from a “line item” to “mission driven” budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate “missions” and “goals” should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on “research” and “studies” to “implement” a “mission statement.” With the City’s vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on “mission driven” budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don’t be GOUGED by Proposition “G”.
Vote “NO” on “G”!

Citizens for Budget Sanity

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Don’t allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City’s budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don’t let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

BREAK IT DOWN: Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

OPEN IT UP: Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

GET IT OUT: Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

KEEP IT OUT: Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

BRING IT HOME: Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

MAKE IT PLAIN: Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!

Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit’s (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot
On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn't be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn't be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn't deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

- Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
- Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
- Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.

Let's make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition I's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Airport BART Station

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it's written so you'll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H's supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO's planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What's needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and La Guardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board's duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its "support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport". This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp's Good Government Committee

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp's argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station "at the Airport" located "on Airport property."

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs.

The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can't afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

89
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International Airport.
San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.
But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to $400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We’ve paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

— San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site — without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing from the city’s general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money to build a single BART station that will only serve international passengers.
We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the airport on BART.
That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can't afford to approve any scheme that's proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that's really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

- Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
- Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travelers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
- Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city’s general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces severe pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bierman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:

- A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electricified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
- A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

- The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.
- The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.
- If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.
- Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzel, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!

Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100 – 400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.

The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.

The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.

Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.

Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco's transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city's history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user's nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city's General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don't allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arensen, Director

----------

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh's third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh's solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh's early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU'RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn't deserve your support and shouldn't even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn't have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp's BART Into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It's motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco's greatest step for public transportation in the city's history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!
If ever the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artist's distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of buffoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing: it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.

It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposition H is politically, not practically motivated.

There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.

It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.

Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco

Thomas F. Hayes
Former BART Director
Patrick J. Dowling
Anne Quilter
Charles J. Sullivan
Mary C. Sullivan
Joan Finucane
Dan Dunnigan
Margaret Mylett
William Fitzgerald
Julia Fitzgerald
Thomas McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Patricia Hayes
Mary O’Donnell
V.P. John Maher Irish-American Political Club
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VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Position I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don't let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh's plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Derske
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuel N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we've paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

"The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport".

Proposition I's initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won't affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world's 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO's future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn't assure us.

Don't stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as “The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance.”

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission’s determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall not divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, with any authority over any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airports commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airports commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I
Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
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PROponent’s Argument in Favor of Proposition I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations.

Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

---

Rebuttal to Proponent’s Argument in Favor of Proposition I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I.”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition “I” forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition “I” station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/ BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 – $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition “I” requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition “I” station only serves one terminal. It’s the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn’t transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition “I” because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I??

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzinger, Architect

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provincial 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LETS MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION II

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzstein, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Graceman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman’s Wharf Merchants’ Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part:

"WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage.

WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million.

WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985...

"RESOLVED, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

---

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don't be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City's general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City's general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City's general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Hertlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

---

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It's the only common sense approach.

Prop I's opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don't be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It’s vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport’s $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART’s own planners, can be constructed at the very same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moveover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let’s be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Michael Strusnky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won’t improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!!

Whether you’re a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinoza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangled before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn’t been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don’t let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let’s move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural “trace” already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it’s time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clot
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport. We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annmarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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It's sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don't want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It's just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco's reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposition, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih's Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right. VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let's Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O'Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

• Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
• Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don't' be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn't in the airport and doesn't meet the needs of today's business travelers? Let's do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENTS. Vote YES on I. Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!

Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENTS, too!

Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over-one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.

Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway. Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway. Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution. And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.

Vote YES on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENTS tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Wetcher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Abbotin, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahnnsa Samchay, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. De Gayette
Joel E. De Gayette
Wilfred Ussery.
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.

I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grand child, grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their final obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

• The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.

• The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.

• Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumbersome transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

Vote Yes on I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo
Manuel A. Rosales
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission
Margaret Cruz
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City’s Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Airline Companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don’t fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Jackson Wong
Restaurateur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club
Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!
VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Rainer, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!
BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.
Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

Vote YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!
You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired), S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lennmon
Nada I. Lennmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART INTO the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART INTO the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street
George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area” — which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.

• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.

• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.

• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.
NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco’s Environment
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10–16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.

• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.

• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.

• The $100–$400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.

• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.

• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtzclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Organizations listed for identification purposes only.
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SamTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport?! If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with a free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
It costs more, but is less convenient.
It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shinko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!

- If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!

- If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!! Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolf

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’TAFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport, and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger finance charges for BART.

2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already determined that MTC will not provide federal or state transit funds for the Prop. I station.

3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds available to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain and SamTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
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PROPOSITION J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How “J” Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor.

The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.
This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.
Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.
Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.
Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.
The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.
If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.
The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.
Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.
What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.
What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.
Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.
Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J. San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM's while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.

Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM's.

Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.

San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.

Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM's is not a good use of scarce Police resources.

Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable.

You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?

Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don't provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.

Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can't help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.

Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn't be in the zone, will be made to move.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM's feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet  
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck  
President, Waldeck's Office Supply

George Michael Patterson  
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on any person's basic rights.

Vote Yes on "J"

Glenda C. Powell  
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez Webber  
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo  
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales  
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy.

THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

The opposition says we would violate panhandler's civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who's civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven't been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need our yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President

Save Our Streets

Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises? Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!!
Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program. Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.
But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.
Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.
Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?
Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.
Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!
Proposition J wastes precious police resources.
Laws already exist to protect ATM users.
Proposition J violates the First Amendment.
You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.
Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians' claims that it "won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens," read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially "off-limits" for ordinary citizens. New "no lingering" zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.

The only people authorized to "linger" in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that "can be conducted" outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of "lingering" to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely "lingering" or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to "move along." Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of "no lingering" zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be "in your face" at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote "NO" on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERETO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco: Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making illegitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each provision violated. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, each such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(3) For each subsequent violation, the penalty for each succeeding violation shall be increased by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $400 and/or community service, for each provision violated, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?  

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance. In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How “K” Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units.

Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units.

In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS."

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right as a voter to approve each housing project.

In the last couple of elections the Supervisors have placed a public-funded housing projects on the ballot which would take City College property away from the students. The voters have twice rejected such proposals. Do we want the Supervisors to have the right to take land away from City College or anywhere else without a vote? Perhaps the next public-funded housing project will be in your neighborhood. With twice the number of public-funded housing projects proposed under Proposition K, these housing units will be everywhere.

Proposition K gives the Supervisors a blank check. Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committeeman of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bansemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors
Low-Income Rental Housing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers. Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K
San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlin Curtin
Pamela David
Yutsum Digidigian
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Helfer
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer's Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don’t know when, we don’t know where, and we don’t know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

I love animals. They are our friends.

Find yourself a best friend.
We're open 7 days a week,
12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

**PARTY CANDIDATES - Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NONPARTISAN CANDIDATES - Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Supt. of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE**
Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATE PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCAL PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, **take this page with you to the polls**. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?
Your return address:

---

Germaine Q Wong  
San Francisco Registrar of Voters  
City Hall -- Room 158  
400 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA  94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

Ballot Type 462
Green Party
12th Congressional District
8th State Senate District
12th Assembly District

Precincts Applicable
2301 through 2612
2801 through 2816

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

ABSSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election
SIGN this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number

City State Zip Code

Check below, if it is true for you:
☐ I have moved since the last time I registered to vote.
☐ My NEW address is printed below.
(Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9411

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version.
☐ I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish _____ Chinese _____

You MUST SIGN here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

The Date You Signed
Your Day Time Phone Number
Your Evening Phone Number

To contact you if there is a problem with your application:
SAN FRANCISCO
VOTER INFORMATION
PAMPHLET AND
SAMPLE BALLOT

JUNE 7, 1994 CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM TO 8 PM
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GERMAINE Q. WONG, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

PLEASE SEE THE LABEL ON THE BACK COVER FOR THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
# Polling Place / Poll Worker Honor Roll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Polling Place Owners</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Poll Worker Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Assembly of God</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chung Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>St. Anne's Home</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Jacqueline Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Ruth Cowan</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Anastasia McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2159</td>
<td>Luise Link</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Suzanne Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Eleanor Achuck</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Tiki Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Josephine Tiongco</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>Aaron Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Lee Yung</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>Missouri Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>Versie McGee</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Leon Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155</td>
<td>Mansion Hotel</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>Frances Ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Sites: San Francisco Unified Schools  
Multiple Poll Workers: Walden House

If you vote at one of the above precincts, please help us thank these people who have performed so well for all of us. Democracy is strong in San Francisco only because dedicated people like these poll workers have contributed their time, energy, and effort as their contribution to civic duty. Of course we cannot acknowledge every one who provided good services. Our plans are to rotate this honor roll.

As a volunteer poll worker you need to attend a one hour training session the weekend before the election. On election day you start at 6:30 a.m. and finish approximately 9:00 p.m. Poll Workers who pick up and deliver ballot boxes as well as act as coordinators are reimbursed $79 for the day. Poll workers with lesser responsibilities are reimbursed $62 for the day. Volunteer one or two days each year to work at a polling place on election day.

# Equal Civic Duty Opportunity - Sign Up Today

**Registrar of Voters - Poll Worker Application**

I live in San Francisco and am a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I want to volunteer to be a poll worker for the Primary Election to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 1994. If I am not currently registered to vote, my registration form is attached.

**Date of Birth (Mo / Day / Yr)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mo</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sign Here**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed First Name</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Printed Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Print the Address Where You Live**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Day Phone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Code</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Ext.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Eve. Phone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Code</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Ext.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to **English**:

- [ ] Cantonese
- [ ] Mandarin
- [ ] Spanish
- [ ] Vietnamese
- [ ] Russian
- [ ] Other:

I HAVE a car: [ ]

(Please Check)

**Assigned Precinct:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Home Precinct:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Affidavit Number:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affidavit Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Clerk:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Inspector:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**E.O. Bk.**


Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA  94102
Si desea recibir una copia de este libro en español, sírvase llamar al 554-4377

PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 7, 1994 Consolidated Primary Election. The pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ........................................... 11-30
2. the location of your polling place; ........................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ........................................... back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ................................................................. 8
5. information for disabled voters; ............................................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .......... 32-33
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ........................................... 37-127
8. definitions of words you need to know; and ........................................... 36
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. ..................... inside back cover
Dear San Francisco Voters:

YOU WOULDN'T FIND EVERY CANDIDATE ON YOUR BALLOT

The June 7, 1994 election, is a primary election. California does not have an "open" primary election, so, in the June primary, you can vote only for candidates who belong to the same political party you do. If you want to vote for a candidate in another political party, you must re-register in that candidate's political party by May 9.¹ Voter registration cards are available at post offices, libraries and the Registrar of Voters office.

Every voter may vote on all state and local measures, and for the following nonpartisan races: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor, and Public Defender. Because this is a primary election, only voters registered with one of these political parties: American Independent, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom, or Republican, may vote for candidates in all the other state races, such as Governor. Again, if you wish to vote for a candidate of a specific political party, you must re-register by May 9 and indicate on your voter registration card the political party to which you want to be affiliated.

In the November 8, 1994 election, you will be able to vote for any candidate regardless of political party affiliation.

B.Y.O.B. (Bring Your Own Ballot)

There's an election coming up soon, so it must be PARTY TIME! Paul Kameny, a San Francisco voter wrote and suggested that voters organize "Sample Ballot Parties." I have heard about such gatherings for years, and when Mr. Kameny came up with the suggestion of promoting these ballot parties throughout the city, I thought it was a great idea. The party is an opportunity for everyone to learn about issues and/or candidates.

1. People invited to the party may be assigned a candidate or ballot measure to "become the expert on that subject."
2. Each person brings their state and city voter information pamphlet / sample ballot to a gathering spot - someone's home, a neighborhood church, a community center, or any place you name.
3. While you eat, drink, and socialize, either pot luck or compliments of the host, a moderator is chosen, everyone takes turns leading the discussion on a candidate or measure.
4. The party may be nonpartisan or partisan, depending on the people you invite.
5. Some parties only cover ballot measures, others concentrate on candidates, but many review both candidates and measures.
6. No one needs to disclose how they will vote.

I hope some of you organize "Sample Ballot Parties." Let us know if you find your party as informative and fun as it has been for others who have attended past parties.

Your vote counts only if you cast your ballot,

Germaine Q Wong
Registrar of Voters

¹ Between April 28 and May 2, this pamphlet was mailed to every voter who was registered on or before April 8, so most of you will receive this pamphlet before the May 9 deadline to re-register.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library for the Blind and Print Handicapped, 3150 Sacramento Street, produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters' office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to complete their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
(PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled, you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee voter mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in a statewide election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll, unless this office has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

____ Lost use of one or more limbs;
____ Lost use of both hands;
____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the second week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the eight digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label. If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 16, please call 554-4375.
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may receive an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel).
Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters. The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. However, when a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot for each election. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications. Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the Office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks, causing you to miss the application deadline. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications. We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or a postcard with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different from your residence address, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Do not sign or initial your ballot card. Your ballot is no longer considered secret if there is such a mark, and thus it cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card. After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of your card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you had never punched them, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including individuals with the power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots. If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

If you become ill or disabled within seven days of an election and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that a ballot can be delivered by your authorized representative. S/he will receive your ballot after presenting the statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences,
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex officio
Deputy City Attorney
Germaine Q Wong, Ex officio
Registrar of Voters

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "the Proposal," "A ‘Yes’ Vote Means," and "A ‘No’ Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee also prepares a table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, and Albert Reen.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Daisy Gordon, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Appointed members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the Office of the Registrar of Voters. It investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco, promotes citizen participation in the electoral process, and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

MAIL DELIVERY OF VOTER PAMPHLETS

The San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot is scheduled to be mailed at the beginning of May. If you registered to vote before April 9, you should receive your Voter Information Pamphlet by May 6.

If you registered to vote or changed your registration after April 8, your Voter Information Pamphlet will be mailed beginning May 13.

If you do not receive your Voter Information Pamphlet in a timely fashion, please notify your local Post Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, and who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before May 9, 1994.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 9, but on or before June 7. May I vote in the June 7 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 9.

Q — If I was arrested or convicted of a crime can I still vote?
A — You can vote as long as you are not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Q — I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in the June 7 election?
A — If you become a U.S. citizen before June 7, you may vote in that election, but you must register to vote by May 9.

Q — I moved on or before May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 9. Can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 9 and June 7, you must go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — For which offices can I vote in this election?
A — You may vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, San Francisco Assessor and San Francisco Public Defender. Also you may vote on state and local ballot measures.

If you are registered in a political party, you may also vote for that party’s candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, Assembly and County Central Committee.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 7, 1994. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote instead of going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 7 if you:
- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994;

OR
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 9 through June 7. The office hours are: from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on June 4 and June 5; and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 7.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can send a note, preferably on a postcard, to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This note must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 31, 1994.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手将投票卡向自动揹投票机插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Paro votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把带鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entregue en el lugar oficial de votacion.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線提起選票交給選舉站值選員。
RESPECT for ANIMALS SHOULD BE HUMAN NATURE.

{ DON'T YOU THINK? }

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Official Ballot — City and County of San Francisco
Ballot Type 463
GREEN PARTY
8th Congressional District
3rd State Senate District
13th Assembly District

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER, NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

To vote for a CANDIDATE whose name appears on the Official Ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, write the name of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot portion of the ballot card.

To vote for any MEASURE, use the blue stylus to punch the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the number which corresponds to the word "YES" or "NO."

Do not make any distinguishing marks or erasures on the ballot card. Distinguishing marks or erasures make the ballot void.

If you fold, tear or damage the ballot card, or punch it incorrectly, return it to the precinct board member to obtain a new ballot card.

Pueden encontrarse instrucciones en español en el reverso de la última pagina de la balota.

中文说明印在选民手册最后一页的背面。

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JOHN T. SELAWSKY</td>
<td>GOVERNADOR</td>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher/Writer</td>
<td>GOBERNADOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maestro/Escritor</td>
<td></td>
<td>教師／作者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JOHN LEWALLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td>商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JAMES OGLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artista</td>
<td></td>
<td>藝術工作者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NONE OF THE ABOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninguno de los anteriores</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>DANIEL MOSES</td>
<td>GREEN PARTY</td>
<td>LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td>編輯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NONE OF THE ABOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninguno de los anteriores</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>我不投選以上任何候選人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MARGARET GARCIA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>NONE OF THE ABOVE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR THIS OFFICE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Asian Language</td>
<td>Spanish Language</td>
<td>English Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor</td>
<td>請選一人</td>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE. Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>請選一人</td>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto.</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE. Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization, Dist. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994**  
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

### US SENATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KENT W. SMITH</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator/Business Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA BLONG</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educador/Asesor comercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE OF THE ABOVE</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninguno de los anteriores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我不投選以上任何候選人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### US REPRESENTATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>美國參議員，第八區</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative, District 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本區没有人備案競選此職位</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATE SENATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>美國參議員，第三區</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator, District 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本區並無此職位之競選</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本区没有人参选此职位</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5 | JUN 7, 1994 | 1994年6月7日 |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| STATE ASSEMBLY | MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13 |
| Member, State Assembly, District 13 |

| NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT. |
| Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本区没有人参选此职位 |

| MIEMBRO, CONCILIO DEL CONDADO DEL PARTIDO VERDE |
| Member, Green Party County Council |

| MICHAEL MONNOT |
| Tipógrafo 植字員 |

| ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| Editor 出版人 |

| BARBARA BLOONG |
| Educadora 教育工作者 |

| BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| Small Business Owner Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主 |

| LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| Student Estudiante 學生 |

| NONE OF THE ABOVE |
| Ninguno de los anteriores |

| Vote for One |
| Vote for no more than 7 |

| 111 | MICHAEL MONNOT |
| 113 | ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| 115 | BARBARA BLOONG |
| 117 | BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| 119 | LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| 121 | NONE OF THE ABOVE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUN 7, 1994</th>
<th>1994年6月7日</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT. |
| Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本区没有人参选此职位 |

| MIEMBRO, CONCILIO DEL CONDADO DEL PARTIDO VERDE |
| Member, Green Party County Council |

| MICHAEL MONNOT |
| Tipógrafo 植字員 |

| ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| Editor 出版人 |

| BARBARA BLOONG |
| Educadora 教育工作者 |

| BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| Small Business Owner Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主 |

| LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| Student Estudiante 學生 |

| NONE OF THE ABOVE |
| Ninguno de los anteriores |

| Vote for One |
| Vote for no more than 7 |

| 111 | MICHAEL MONNOT |
| 113 | ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| 115 | BARBARA BLOONG |
| 117 | BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| 119 | LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| 121 | NONE OF THE ABOVE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUN 7, 1994</th>
<th>1994年6月7日</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT. |
| Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本区没有人参选此职位 |

| MIEMBRO, CONCILIO DEL CONDADO DEL PARTIDO VERDE |
| Member, Green Party County Council |

| MICHAEL MONNOT |
| Tipógrafo 植字員 |

| ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| Editor 出版人 |

| BARBARA BLOONG |
| Educadora 教育工作者 |

| BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| Small Business Owner Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主 |

| LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| Student Estudiante 學生 |

| NONE OF THE ABOVE |
| Ninguno de los anteriores |

| Vote for One |
| Vote for no more than 7 |

| 111 | MICHAEL MONNOT |
| 113 | ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| 115 | BARBARA BLOONG |
| 117 | BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| 119 | LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| 121 | NONE OF THE ABOVE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUN 7, 1994</th>
<th>1994年6月7日</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT. |
| Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本区没有人参选此职位 |

| MIEMBRO, CONCILIO DEL CONDADO DEL PARTIDO VERDE |
| Member, Green Party County Council |

| MICHAEL MONNOT |
| Tipógrafo 植字員 |

| ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| Editor 出版人 |

| BARBARA BLOONG |
| Educadora 教育工作者 |

| BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| Small Business Owner Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主 |

| LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| Student Estudiante 學生 |

| NONE OF THE ABOVE |
| Ninguno de los anteriores |

| Vote for One |
| Vote for no more than 7 |

| 111 | MICHAEL MONNOT |
| 113 | ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| 115 | BARBARA BLOONG |
| 117 | BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| 119 | LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| 121 | NONE OF THE ABOVE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUN 7, 1994</th>
<th>1994年6月7日</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT. |
| Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本区没有人参选此职位 |

| MIEMBRO, CONCILIO DEL CONDADO DEL PARTIDO VERDE |
| Member, Green Party County Council |

| MICHAEL MONNOT |
| Tipógrafo 植字員 |

| ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| Editor 出版人 |

| BARBARA BLOONG |
| Educadora 教育工作者 |

| BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| Small Business Owner Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主 |

| LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| Student Estudiante 學生 |

| NONE OF THE ABOVE |
| Ninguno de los anteriores |

| Vote for One |
| Vote for no more than 7 |

| 111 | MICHAEL MONNOT |
| 113 | ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| 115 | BARBARA BLOONG |
| 117 | BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| 119 | LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| 121 | NONE OF THE ABOVE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUN 7, 1994</th>
<th>1994年6月7日</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly, District 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NO CANDIDATES FILED FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT. |
| Ningún candidato presentó su candidatura para este puesto en este distrito. 本区没有人参选此职位 |

| MIEMBRO, CONCILIO DEL CONDADO DEL PARTIDO VERDE |
| Member, Green Party County Council |

| MICHAEL MONNOT |
| Tipógrafo 植字員 |

| ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| Editor 出版人 |

| BARBARA BLOONG |
| Educadora 教育工作者 |

| BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| Small Business Owner Propietaria de una pequeña empresa 小商業東主 |

| LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| Student Estudiante 學生 |

| NONE OF THE ABOVE |
| Ninguno de los anteriores |

| Vote for One |
| Vote for no more than 7 |

<p>| 111 | MICHAEL MONNOT |
| 113 | ROBERT VON HOLDT |
| 115 | BARBARA BLOONG |
| 117 | BETTY L. TRAYNOR |
| 119 | LUCY GOVORCHIN |
| 121 | NONE OF THE ABOVE |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David L. Kilber</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol S. Koppel</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis S. Keizer</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry L. Martin</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Joseph Anthony Mele</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph D. Carrabino</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildbert Smith</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert &quot;Rob&quot; Stewart</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Rice</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorria Matta Tuchman</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen G. Dimarco</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLaine Eastin</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris M. Ward</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>Nonpartisan</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Earthquake Relief and Seismic Retrofit Bond Act of 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars ($2,000,000,000) to provide funds for an earthquake relief and seismic retrofit program.</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Safe Schools Act of 1994. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools and the authorization to allocate bond funds and interest derived therefrom from the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1952 for present-day public school construction or improvement.</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1994. To renew California’s economic vitality and to regain our state’s high quality of life, this act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) for the strengthening, upgrading, and constructing of public colleges and universities throughout the state. These projects will create jobs and strengthen the state’s economy by providing adult and student job training opportunities and by enabling public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce. They will repair and rebuild college classrooms, which will strengthen college campuses to prevent injuries in future earthquakes. They will provide alternatives to crime and gangs by ensuring access to higher education. They will improve the quality of learning at public campuses by improving classrooms and providing modern teaching technologies. Authorized projects for the 136 public campuses include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health and safety improvements, upgrading of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, improving and modernizing campus computer capabilities, and construction of classrooms and libraries. No moneys derived from the sale of the bonds will be expended for administrative overhead.</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACTA DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA RETROAJUSTE SISMICO Y ALIVIO EN CASO DE TERREMOTOS

159 SI 贊成
160 NO 反對

1994年地殼運動及防震減災
改革公債法案。本法案規定發行
二十億元($2,000,000,000)的公
債，用於一九九四年度地殼運動及防震減災
改革計劃提供經費。

### ACTA DE 1994 PARA ESCUELAS SEGURAS

163 SI 贊成
164 NO 反對

1994年安全學校法例，本案
法規定發行十億元($1,000,000,000)
的公債。提供經費以建設或改
造學校。並授權分撥一九九三年州
校舍補助公債到期的公債全額利
息收入用於目前公校的建築或改
造。

### ACTA DE JUNIO DE 1994 DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR

169 SI 贊成
170 NO 反對

1994年六月高等教育設施公
債法例，為維持加州的基礎生
命力和吸引州內的高等教育學
者。本法案授權發行一億九千億
元($900,000,000)的公債。用於全
州加強、提高以及建設公立大學
校舍及大學。這些工程將製造就業機
會及加強加州的經濟。成年入
和學生提供職業訓練的機會。向公立學校和大學提供就業訓練有
效和有競爭力的人才。這些計
劃並將修繕和重建校舍的課
室，鞏固校園設施，預防未來
的災難中發生受傷事件。這些計
劃又向市民保證高等教育機會，
提供不參加犯罪和反對活動的另
一選擇。通過改善學校和提供現
代教學技術，這些計劃將改善公
立高等院校的學習環境與質量。

法案授權改進136家公立學校的各
種項目，包括但不限於：防震和
其他公共安全改善計劃；更新實
驗室以追上科學進展；院校電腦
設備的更新與現代化；以及建築
新校舍和圖書館。所有由出售公
債所得的款項和產生的收入，均
不會用於日常行政開支。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

8E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

175 RENTER'S INCOME TAX CREDIT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to provide qualified renters with an income tax credit of not less than $60 for individuals and $120 for others. Fiscal Impact: State costs of $100 million in 1995 – 96. Unknown but potential costs in the future, as the state would be prevented from making reductions in the renters’ credit.

176 TAXATION: NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Exempts qualifying nonprofit organizations from locally-imposed business license taxes or fees measured by income or gross receipts. Fiscal Impact: Little, if any, effect on local government revenues in the near-term.

177 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. DISABLED PERSONS’ ACCESS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the construction, installation, removal, or modification of all or any part of a building or structure for disabled persons’ access. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years probably in the range of $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反對

CRECITO TRIBUTARIO A LOS INGRESOS DE LOS INQUILINOS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la Constitución para otorgar a los inquilinos calificados un crédito tributario a los ingresos de no menos de $60 para individuos y de no menos de $120 para los demás. Impacto fiscal: Costos del Estado de $100 millones en 1995 - 96. Costos desconocidos pero potenciales en el futuro, ya que el Estado no podría efectuar reducciones del crédito tributario a los inquilinos.

175

191 SI 贊成
192 NO 反對

IMPOSICION TRIBUTARIA: ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exime a las organizaciones sin fines de lucro calificadas de las imposiciones tributarias locales sobre las licencias comerciales o sobre los aranceles medidos por los ingresos o a los ingresos brutos. Impacto fiscal: Mínimo o nulo sobre los ingresos devengados a corto plazo por el gobierno local.

176

198 SI 贊成
199 NO 反對

EXENCION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. ACCESO DE PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Permite que la Legislatura exima del impuesto sobre la propiedad a la construcción, instalación, remoción o modificación de todo o parte de un edificio existente o estructura para permitir que las personas incapacitadas tengan acceso a dicho edificio o estructura. Impacto fiscal: Después de varios años, probables pérdidas de los gobiernos locales de ingresos devengados por la recaudación impositiva sobre la propiedad de unos $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares y de universidades comunitarias (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

177
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

9E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

178 PROPERTY TAX EXCLUSION. WATER CONSERVATION EQUIPMENT. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends state constitution to exclude from property taxation the installation of water conservation equipment, as defined by Legislature, for agricultural purposes. Fiscal Impact: Property tax revenue losses to local governments after several years possibly up to $10 million annually. The state would replace those losses incurred by school districts (about half the total).

179 MURDER: PUNISHMENT. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Provides for a sentence of 20 years to life upon conviction of second-degree murder that is committed by intentionally shooting a firearm from a vehicle at another person outside of the vehicle with the intent to inflict great bodily injury. Fiscal impact: Unknown, probably not major, increase in state costs.

180 PARK LANDS, HISTORIC SITES, WILDLIFE AND FOREST CONSERVATION BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes bond issuance of almost $2 billion for the acquisition, development, and conservation of designated areas throughout California. Fiscal impact: State costs of about $3.6 billion to pay off the principal ($2 billion) and interest ($1.6 billion) on general obligation bonds. Unknown state and local costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to operate and maintain properties.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
BALOTA APARTADARIA
CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

211 SI 買成
212 NO 反對
EXCLUSION TRIBUTARIA DEL IMPUESTO SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD. EQUIPOS PARA CONSERVACION DE AGUA. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Enmienda la constitución estatal para excuir del impuesto sobre la propiedad la parte de cualquier mejora efectuada a un bien raíz que consista de la instalación de equipos para conservación de agua según los define la Legislatura, para fines agrícolas. Impacto fiscal: Tras varios años los gobiernos locales podrían sufrir pérdidas de ingresos devengados por las recaudaciones impositivas sobre la propiedad de hasta $10 millones anuales. El Estado reemplazaría las pérdidas incurridas por los distritos escolares (aproximadamente la mitad del total).

218 SI 買成
219 NO 反對
ASESINATO: CASTIGO. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA POR INICIATIVA. Estipula una sentencia de 20 años hasta cadena perpetua para los que hayan sido declarados culpables de haber cometido un asesinato de segundo grado por haber disparado un arma de fuego intencionalmente desde un vehículo a otra persona fuera del vehículo, con la intención de infingirle daños corporales graves. Impacto fiscal: Aumentos desconocidos, pero probablemente no significativos, en los costos estatales.

224 SI 買成
225 NO 反對
LEY DE BONOS PARA TERRENO DE PARQUES, SITIOS HISTORICOS, CONSERVACION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE Y DE LOS BOSQUES. LEY DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de casi $2 mil millones para la adquisición, desarrollo y conservación de zonas designadas por todo California. Impacto fiscal: Costos al Estado de unos $3,6 mil millones para pagar el capital ($2 mil millones) y los intereses ($1,6 mil millones) de los bonos de responsabilidad general. Costos estatales y locales desconocidos, potencialmente decenas de millones de dólares, para manejar y mantener las propiedades.
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SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

10E
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes. YES 237  
NO 238

B Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services? YES 244  
NO 245

C Shall the City’s aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year? YES 251  
NO 252

D Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol? YES 256  
NO 257
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反对

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR UNIFICADO DE SAN FRANCISCO. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $95,000,000 para la adquisición, construcción y/o reconstrucción de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, las que incluyen modificaciones a las instalaciones, construcción de nuevas mejoras, mejoras para acatar el Acta Americana de Incapacidades, eliminación y disminución de ciertos materiales peligrosos y la adquisición, construcción o reconstrucción relacionadas, necesarias o convenientes para los propósitos anteriores.

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反对

¿Desea que la Ciudad celebre contratos de financiamiento por arrendamiento con la Corporación de Financiamiento por Arrendamiento de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco o una corporación similar sin fines de lucro, cuyas obligaciones o evidencia de endeudamiento no exceda la cantidad conjunta principal de Sesenta Millones de dólares ($60,000,000) para el propósito de construir un centro de despacho combinado y adquirir equipos relacionados, entre los que se incluye un sistema de despacho asistido por computadoras, para los servicios de policía, bomberos y médicos de emergencia?

251 SI 贊成
252 NO 反对

¿Desea que el límite de la deuda conjunta principal de la Ciudad para el financiamiento por arrendamiento de equipos sin la aprobación de los electores se aumente desde $20,000,000 a $40,000,000, aumentando dicho límite en adelante en un cinco por ciento anual?

256 SI 贊成
257 NO 反对

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad emplee un mínimo de 1971 oficiales de policía de servicio total, con un énfasis en asignar oficiales a vigilancia y patrulla en los vecindarios?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at levels no lower than that for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad mantenga fondos para el Departamento de Bibliotecas a niveles no inferiores que aquellos del año fiscal 1993 – 94 y que establezca un Fondo de Conservación de la Biblioteca que será usado sólo para servicios adicionales de la biblioteca, colocando una cierta cantidad de los ingresos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad en dicho fondo anualmente, y se requerirá que la Ciudad mantenga abierta una biblioteca principal y 26 sucursales durante una cantidad mínima especificada de horas por semana?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

¿Desea permitir que los empleados jubilados de la Ciudad que tengan habilidades o conocimientos especiales puedan volver a trabajar para la Ciudad durante no más de 120 días o 960 horas por año y sigan recibiendo beneficios jubilatorios mientras trabajan?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反對

¿Desea que el proceso actual de generación de presupuestos de la Ciudad por lista detallada de ítems sea reemplazado por un proceso presupuestario basado en cada proyecto?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad seleccione el sitio para la estación del BART del Aeropuerto que sea el más económico, práctico y seguro, tal como está definido en la medida, sin aumentar los impuestos municipales y desviar fondos municipales de los programas de policía, bomberos, salud pública o bibliotecas?

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反對

¿Desea que se requiera que la Ciudad tome todas las acciones necesarias para extender el servicio del BART al área de la terminal del Aeropuerto y que se requiera que la Comisión de Aeropuertos tome todas las acciones correspondientes para generar los fondos necesarios para esta extensión del BART, que primero utilizará cualquier fondo disponible del Aeropuerto, regional, estatal y federal, y si fuera necesario, adoptará un arancel para los pasajeros por el uso de las instalaciones, en caso de ser aprobado esto por el gobierno federal?

樣否規定市政府對圖書館的撥款額，保持不低于1993-94財政年度的水平，並成立一個圖書館保護金，每年從房產稅中撥出一定數額存入保護金中，這些保護金可用於增加圖書館服務，以及應在規定市政府對圖書館和26個分館的開放時間指定每週至少要若干小時？

樣否有特別技能和專業知識的已退休的市職員復職，但每年工作不超過120日或960小時，而他們在工作時仍可以繼續領取退休金？

市政府規定的項目預算程序應否改為執行任務預算程序？

樣否要求市政府按照本提案的規定選拔最有成本效益、最能安全的終點“八達通”車站，而不必加強或調用市警察、消防、衛生或圖書館計劃的基金？

樣否規定市政府採取一切必要措施，把“八達通”服務延續到機場區。並且，應否要求機場委員會採取一切適當措施，籌集所需資金，用於延長機場區的“八達通”服務。該“八達通”額外的機場基金以及地方，用於聯邦政府的基金，如有必要，如獲聯邦政府批准，制定旅客用的設施收費？
SAMPLE BALLOT
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

J  Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?  YES 289  NO 290

K  Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?  YES 295  NO 296

END OF BALLOT
# SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE JUNIO DE 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

| 289 SI 贊成 | ¿Desea que se prohíba a las personas que holgazaneen o se quedan dentro de los treinta pies de una máquina de cajero automático ("ATM") durante más de un minuto, mientras otra persona esté usando dicha máquina? |
| 290 NO 反對 |

| 295 SI 贊成 | ¿Desea que los patrocinadores públicos o privados, con la asistencia financiera de una agencia pública del estado, tengan la autorización de desarrollar, construir y/o adquirir proyectos de viviendas de bajo alquiler dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para proporcionar no más de 3000 unidades de alquiler económico para el alojamiento de personas y familias de bajos ingresos, entre las que se incluyen personas ancianas o incapacitadas? |
| 296 NO 反對 |

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 7, 1994
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES:

SOLAMENTE DEBE PERFORAR LA TARJETA DE BALOTA CON EL INSTRUMENTO DE VOTACION QUE SE ENCUENTRA SUJETADO A LA MESA DE VOTACION; NUNCA DEBE UTILIZAR UNA PLUMA O UN LAPIZ.

Para votar por un CANDIDATO cuyo nombre aparece en la Balota Oficial, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado con una flecha al lado del número que corresponda a dicho candidato.

Para votar por un candidato NO LISTADO, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto para tal propósito en la porción de la tarjeta de balota con el título "Balota para un candidato no listado."

Para votar por cualquier MEDIDA, perfora la tarjeta de balota en el lugar señalado por la flecha enfrente del número que corresponda a las palabras "SI" o "NO."

No haga ninguna marca ni borradura en la tarjeta de balota. Dichas marcas o borraduras anularán la balota.

Si usted dobla, rompe o daña la tarjeta de balota, o si la perfora incorrectamente, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga una nueva tarjeta.

選民須知:

請只用附在投票機上的打孔針在選票卡上打孔，切勿使用筆或鉛筆。

投票給選票上的候選人，請用藍針在該候選人的姓名對面箭頭所指處打孔。

投票給合格的“寫入”候選人，請在選票卡的空格上寫入該人姓名和他競選的官職。

投票任何提案，請用藍針在箭頭所指號碼 "YES" 或 "NO" 打孔。

選票如有塗改或擦過痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你撕破、撕破或損毀了選票，或投票時打錯了孔，
請把選票退回給選舉站的監選員，另取一份新選票卡。

Instructions in English are on the first ballot page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR,
VUELVA A LA PRIMERA PAGINA.

TO START VOTING,
TURN BACK TO THE FIRST PAGE.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is currently paid $111,812 each year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid $123,323 each year.
The Public Defender represents some persons who cannot afford to pay for their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

---

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.
The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidate for Assessor

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Ct. #1409
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I am deeply grateful that through my service on the Community College Board, the Board of Supervisors — culminating in my election as President — San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and political persuasion have supported my efforts.

As your Assessor, I am proud of our accomplishments since my appointment.

We have modernized to improve efficiency, developed a new computer system to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness — providing better services to the public with a smaller staff.

My commitment is to make this the best Assessor’s office possible, at a cost we can afford. I would appreciate your vote to continue my work.

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., #17C, Assemblyman.
Charlotte Maillard Swig, 999 Green St.
Frank M. Jordan, 2529 Fillmore St., Mayor, City and County of San Francisco.
Angela Alioto, 2606 Pacific Ave., President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Michael Hennessey, 74 Banks St., Sheriff of San Francisco.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
Dr. Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor.
Douglas Shoreinstein, 2630 Divisadero St., Corporate President.
Louise Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Matthew Rothschild, 339 Chestnut St., Attorney.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco.
Henry Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Michael Hardeman, 329 Wawona, Union Representative.
Cecil Williams, 60 Hilihurst St., Minister.
Kevin Shelley, 20 San Antonio #1B, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Sue Berman, 1529 Shrader St., Supervisor.
Carole Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Member, Board of Supervisors.
Willie B. Kennedy, 50 Chumashero Blvd. #7E, Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 820 Laguna Honda Blvd., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Anne Marie Conroy, 1135 Bay #11, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Nancy Lewin, 9 Gerke Alley, Attorney at Law.
Cordell Oliver, 2828 Irving St., Manager, S.F. Housing Authority.
Tina Burgess Conan, 59 Chabot Terrace, Housewife.
Deborah Rohrer, 1542 11th Ave., Corporate Vice-President.
Natalie Berg, 20 Ashbury Terrace, Educator.
Sandra Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Secretary.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: It is the duty of the Public Defender to represent people accused of crimes who cannot afford an attorney. Since 1978 you have continuously elected me to this office. I am deeply grateful for this honor.

In the last fifteen years the outstanding women and men of the Public Defender's office have worked tirelessly to protect the rights of the poor people in our courts. In doing so, they have protected the rights of all of us.

In the next four years we will continue to uphold the high standards of professionalism and efficiency that the people of San Francisco deserve.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Consultant.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Miranda D. Brown, 850 40th Ave., Student.
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Artist.
John L. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Assemblyman.
Jim B. Clarke, 480 Funston Ave.
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney.
John C. Farrell, 2990 24th Ave., Retired City Controller.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, United States Senator.
Loretta M. Gilgo, 135 Gardenside Dr. #115, Attorney.
David M. Goldstein, 1830 Beach St. #7, Attorney.
Michael Hennessy, 74 Banks St, Sheriff of San Francisco.
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney.
Tom Hsieh, 1151 Taylor St., Supervisor.
Cherlyn A. Jefferson, 1339 Pierce St., Project Manager.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Consultant.
Peter G. Keane, 1438 Cabrillo, Attorney.
Grant S. Mickins, III, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Retired HRC Director.
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Retired Teacher.
Carole V. Migden, 1960 Hayes St. #6, Member, Board of Supervisors.
James B. Morales, 366 Arlington St., Public Interest Lawyer.
Louise H. Renne, 3905 Clay Street, City Attorney.
Rodei E. Rodla, 35 Paloma Ave., SF Community College Board Member.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Albert J. Vidal, 440 Gold Mine Dr., High School Principal.
Eugene R. Wallach, 155 Jackson St., #907, Lawyer.
L. Ling-Chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor.
Calvin P. Welch, 519 Ashbury, Community Organizer.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AN OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO'S BOND DEBT

BACKGROUND

What is Bond Financing? Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects. The City receives money by selling "bonds" to investors. The City must pay back to the investors the amount borrowed along with interest.

The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, libraries and major earthquake repairs. The City uses bond financing mainly because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major kinds of bonds — Revenue and General Obligation.

Revenue bonds are paid back from revenues generated by bond-financed projects. For example, the airport can finance a major expansion through revenue bonds which will be paid back from landing fees charged to airlines that use the improvements.

General Obligation bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example: police and fire stations, libraries, major park rehabilitation or cultural facility projects). General Obligation bonds must be approved by the voters. Once they are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes.

In addition, the City can borrow money through voter approved long-term lease financing contracts. These are used primarily for purchases or equipment and are generally for less than 10 years.

What are the direct costs of using bonds? The City’s cost for using bonds depends on the interest rate that is paid on the bonds and the number of years over which they are paid off. Most general obligation bonds are paid off over a period of 10 to 20 years. Assuming an interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off bonds over 20 years is about $1.65 for each dollar borrowed — $1 for the dollar borrowed and 65 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period, and so the cost after adjusting for inflation reduces the effective cost because future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% future annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off bonds in today’s dollars would be about $1.15 per $1 borrowed.

THE CITY’S CURRENT DEBT SITUATION

The amount of City debt. As of March 1, 1994, there was about $1.2 billion of general obligation debt authorized by the voters and either outstanding or unissued. Of this total, $593 million has been issued and is outstanding, leaving $604 million authorized to be issued in the future. The amount of bonds issued is less than the amount authorized since the City only issues the amount of debt that it needs at a given time.

The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the City and County. The current limit is about $1.7 billion. However a more prudent limit is somewhat less than the 3% legal cap. As noted above, the City currently has $593 million of bonds issued and outstanding.

Debt Payments. Total general obligation bond “debt service” during 1993-94 should be $69.7 million. (“Debt Service” is the annual repayment of a portion of the monies borrowed plus the interest owed on all outstanding bonds.) This is paid by assessing 12.2 cents on every $100 of property tax assessed valuation. This means that a property owner with an assessed valuation of $250,000 would pay about $300 this year for debt service on the city’s outstanding general obligation bonds (and $2,500 for general City operations, schools, community college, children’s fund, open space and other government purposes — for a total tax bill of $2,800.).

MEASURES ON THIS BALLOT

Proposition A on this ballot would increase the total of bonds authorized by $95 million. If this bond were to be approved and issued, the debt service would add about one and one-half cents per $100 of assessed valuation to the property tax rate. However, the City or School District typically does not issue all of the authorized bonds at one time. If these bonds are issued over time, there may be little or no net increase to the property tax rate because other general obligation bonds will have been paid off and will no longer require funding through property taxes.

In addition, Propositions B and C would authorize lease financing programs worth up to $80 million which could be partially paid back out of the general fund of the City. While these would have no impact on property taxes, they would be included in an investor’s calculation of our debt limit.

Prepared by the Office of the Controller
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures. For each measure, an analysis has been prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee. This analysis includes a brief explanation of the way it is now, what each proposal would do, what a "Yes" vote means, and what a "No" vote means. There is a statement by the City's Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure. There is also a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot.

Following the analysis page, you will find arguments for and against each measure. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. They have not been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument"
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument"
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
CHARTER — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A Charter Amendment changes the City Charter, or constitution, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people. (Propositions C, D, E, F, and G)

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy to the extent legally possible. (Proposition K)

GENERAL FUND — Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used for City services such as police and fire protection services, transportation, libraries, recreation, arts and health services. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees. This money is not earmarked for any specific purpose. Currently, the General Fund is 34% of the City's budget. The other 66% of the budget comes from federal and state government grants, revenues generated and used by the same department, and tax money collected for a specific purpose.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell General Obligation Bonds. (Proposition A)

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot. It is placed on the ballot by having a certain number of voters sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people. (Propositions E and I)

LEASE FINANCING — When a city or other local government wants to make improvements to buildings or land, or buy equipment, it may decide to use lease financing as a method of payment. Usually, a non-profit corporation created for this purpose will buy the building, land or equipment and borrow the money to pay for it. The city then leases it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments until it is fully purchased. (Propositions B and C)

ORDINANCE — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by voters. (Propositions H, I, and J)

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party's candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people who want to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate.

The purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE for each office. You will vote for a candidate from the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists only ballot measures and candidates for non-partisan offices.
PROPOSITION A
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Most school buildings are old and in need of repair. Federal and state laws require that school buildings be made accessible to disabled people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $95 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The School District plans to use $58 million to repair existing schools and improve access for disabled people. The School District also plans to use $37 million to build an elementary school in the Tenderloin, to provide the School of the Arts with a more suitable building, and to rebuild and expand other schools.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid out of property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds totaling $95 million for school repairs and construction.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for these purposes.

Controller's Statement on "A"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $95,000,000
- Bond interest: $56,356,250
- Debt service requirement: $152,356,250

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $7,612,812 which amount is equivalent to one and forty-six hundredths cents ($0.0146) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $36.50. It should be noted however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"
On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
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PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has a long tradition of strong support for its public schools. Six years ago we began a program to address school building needs that were the result of a decade of underfunding. For the first time in years, schools were painted, yards were paved, and roofs were repaired. Proposition A will continue San Francisco’s commitment to providing safe, quality facilities for all of our 64,000 public school children.

Proposition A Funds will provide the opportunity, for the first time in decades, to build modern state-of-the-art facilities to house innovative and successful programs; such as:

- A School of The Arts in the Civic Center.
- The expansion of Rooftop Alternative School into the middle school grades.
- Replacing crumbling “temporary” bungalows at Argonne Year Round School
- An elementary school for the children of the Tenderloin who are now bused to over 40 locations throughout the City.
- New facilities for Mission district schools, including Las Americas and George Moscone.

Proposition A is the next stage of the maintenance program which will include:

- Removing environmental hazards like asbestos and lead paint.
- Installing exterior security lighting systems.
- Providing full handicap access as required by law.
- Replacing antiquated lighting and electrical systems.
- Modernizing plumbing in bathrooms, kitchens and science laboratories.
- Upgrading inadequate heating and ventilation systems.

Public school facilities are important community meeting places for neighborhood organizations and civic groups. Adequate facilities are essential to the City’s economic future and quality of life. Business and labor, teachers and parents, principals and civic leaders are joining with Superintendent Bill Rojas and the School Board to provide safe, quality schools for our children. We urge all citizens to vote YES on Proposition A. The future of San Francisco is dependent on our commitment to the children of this great City.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is another way to increase taxes on already overburdened San Franciscans. What is worse, the money will be wasted.

According to Nanette Asimov, San Francisco Chronicle, January 11, 1994: “As recently as December 21, 1993, Superintendent Rojas wanted to use all the bond money for repairs... but an advisory committee recommended that Rojas lower the amount of the bond and use some of the money to build new schools.

“Rojas took half of the advice. He stood by the $95 million bond issue, but hastily collected requests for new buildings. . . .”

The plan to move the San Francisco Community School into a new facility in the Sunset costing $1 million, once the John O’Connell High School is moved into a new building, includes no money to move O’Connell.

It’s “politics as usual”.

Meanwhile, these cost saving measures are ignored:

- Leasing privately constructed and maintained buildings.
- “Contracting out” routine administrative, janitorial, maintenance, and repair services.

- Encouraging creation of charter schools that use parents and community volunteers to perform janitorial and landscaping work.
- Reducing the number of administrators so the money gets to the classroom.

Why give more money to a School Board that is better at making excuses than educating children, cannot maintain school discipline, and continues to waste money? Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O’Brien
Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

With Proposition A the San Francisco School Board is demanding more bonds to pay for facilities, yet these are the same people who permitted the existing schools to deteriorate. Apparently, they would rather put their operating funds into hiring administrators and paying non-classroom expenses than into repairs and maintenance.

The School Board has lost all control of costs — but it's the taxpayers who suffer. Is it any wonder that middle class families are fleeing from a city with only one acceptable public high school and the highest cost of living in the nation? Is it any wonder that parents are sick and tired of paying for schools that can't keep their children safe or maintain discipline?

Is it any wonder that taxpayers who have watched less and less money go into teaching children and more and more money go to non-teachers salaries no longer trust the School Board?

There are ways to save money, but the School Board would rather "stick it" to the taxpayers instead of behaving responsibly. Say "No" to bureaucratic waste. Vote NO on Proposition A.

George L. O'Brien, Chairman, San Francisco Libertarian Party
Mark Valverde, Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district
Mark Read Pickens, Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district
Anton Sherwood, Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Not one dollar of Proposition A bond proceeds will be spent on hiring school administrators or paying non-classroom expenses. Don't believe the political rhetoric of the opponents of Proposition A. The truth is, Proposition A funds will only be used to repair existing neighborhood schools and build additional classrooms.

In particular, Proposition A bond proceeds will be used to install security systems, expand libraries, remove asbestos hazards, ensure compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and replace antiquated heating, plumbing and electrical systems and science and computer laboratories in virtually every school in the District.

Proposition A funds will also be used to rebuild a School of the Arts, and a new elementary for Tenderloin children; replace the crumbling “temporary” bungalows at the Richmond District's Argonne Year Round School and the Sunset district's John O'Connell School; provide new facilities for Mission district schools; and expand the Rooftop Alternative School in Twin Peaks.

Our children deserve to learn in safe schools. Only by passing Proposition A will this happen. If the opponents of Proposition A are successful, San Franciscans will be "stuck" with schools that are unsafe, outdated and poorly equipped to allow our kids to compete in the years ahead. For the sake of our children, vote YES ON PROPOSITON A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

I, along with other property owners, recognize the need for the improvement of public schools within San Francisco. We are dedicated to supporting intelligent initiatives to invest in our ailing educational system. Since it is clear that all members of the San Franciscan community would benefit greatly from a strong school system, doesn't it seem fair that all should share the burden of this effort? Unfortunately, this is not the nature of this bond measure. Instead of calling upon all San Franciscans to help remedy this situation, this bond measure targets only owners of property, assessing them exclusively, without allowing them to share the cost with renters. While property owners are more than willing to do their share for this worthy cause, it seems only fair that all citizens be called upon to assist in this process.

It is because of this unjust assessment of a select group of San Franciscans that I urge you to vote against this particular bond measure.

Property owners are enthusiastic about investment in our collective community. We simply ask that the funds for these initiatives be raised in a just and fair manner.

Peter Edeneuer

Vote NO on Proposition A

If your car weren't running would you give it a new coat of paint? Presumably, the San Francisco Unified School District would. And, that's the fallacy of Proposition A.

It's no secret that public schools in San Francisco are a disgrace. Discipline is almost totally lacking, creating an atmosphere which is not at all conducive to teaching. That is one of the reasons students in San Francisco's schools have among the lowest test scores in the country.

Proposition A would authorize the issuance of $95 million in general obligation bonds for improvements to 110 school sites. The improvements would consist of 599 repair and new construction projects.

Everyone can agree, San Francisco's public schools are in desperate need of attention. But the district has its priorities mixed up. It should concentrate on elevating teaching standards first and then give attention to school facilities.

A new coat of paint may make your car look great, but if the engine isn't working, it won't get you anywhere.

Vote "NO" on Proposition A.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

Proposition A is UNFAIR.

On its face, Proposition A is a good idea . . . the way they propose to pay for it is a BAD idea.

Most San Francisco voters do not own property. This means that the majority of San Franciscans can vote to impose bonds and taxes on the minority (property owners) for which they have no responsibility.

Fairness dictates that anyone voting for taxes should pay for those same taxes. Why not vote for taxes from which you benefit but don't have to pay? Everyone's quality of life increases with passage of correct and needed bonds. Everyone should pay. Proposition A doesn't do that.

As a parent with a school aged child, I urge to vote NO on Proposition A.

Charles E. Moore
President
McGuire Real Estate

San Franciscans are committed to our educational system. We all care about our schools. That's why in November of 1993, 80% of San Franciscans voted against Proposition 174, the voucher system. In June of 1993 we passed a 1/4 cent sales tax for schools, making permanent the tax we voted for in 1991. In 1990 we approved another $127 million special earthquake tax for schools. And only six years ago, we approved another $90 million in school bonds.

We care, and we've shown it.

Now school administrators are asking us to go another $95 million ($152 million with interest) into debt to pay for the maintenance they deferred.

Isn't it time for the school administrators to show us what they can do? Shouldn't their priorities be increasing student's test scores and decreasing school violence? Before they ask us for more money they should show us that they can act responsibly with the financial commitment we have already made to our schools.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a high-interest, high-cost bond issue to allow San Francisco’s current public officials the luxury of avoiding hard choices. This general obligation bond measure, financed by our property taxes, intends to furnish a staggering $95,000,000 to the San Francisco Unified School District for a variety of so-called improvement projects. Proposition A doesn’t provide for any oversight or accountability for how these funds are spent.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

A $90,000,000 school bond measure (Prop. A) was passed in 1988 under similar auspices. Where has that money gone? We can’t just hand our public administrators another check, a $95,000,000 check, with debt to be financed by our money and our children’s money, without asking for more accountability and oversight! There is no assurance that the funds furnished by this bond measure will be used for worthwhile purposes. Stop taking San Franciscans’ money!

We owe our children our strongest efforts to provide them with the best and safest educational facilities possible. We also owe them our unwavering commitment to fiscal responsibility and a promise that the funds we want spent in their behalf actually are. Proposition A does not provide accountability and does not deserve our votes!

Taxpayers deserve more accountability!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Eric Andresen, Director

Here they go again! Over the last five years the San Francisco School Board has imposed at least three new taxes on San Franciscans: a parcel tax, a bond, and a dedicated increase in the sales tax. Now they want another $95,000,000 bond for repairs and maintenance.

Included in the latest list of projects is $10,000,000 for window sash replacements, $7,300,000 for toilet rehabilitation, and $2,250,000 for “door rehabilitation.” In the meantime, educational achievement deteriorates.

Hey, School Board! It’s not the doors that need rehabilitating!
San Francisco property owners are tired of paying more and more for less and less. Until the School Board gets its priorities straight, Vote NO! on new taxes. No on Proposition A!

Tim Carrico
President, San Francisco Apartment Association

If School Bond Measure A passes, the excellent programs and perfectly good buildings currently located at Las Americas Children’s Center and George Moscone Elementary School will be needlessly destroyed, supposedly for a new site for John O’Connell High School.

In its June 1994 General Obligation Bond, the S.F. Unified School District describes the Las Americas/Moscone buildings as “temporary” and further alleges that their condition is “critical”. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE!

More than 600 parents, community members, and staff have signed petitions demanding that the School District abort its plan to tear down Las Americas and Moscone, but they have been ignored. We need to keep our sites and open space. Vote NO on Measure A.

Linda De La Rosa, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Andrew L. Solow, Member — Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Vicki Rega, Mission Resident & John O’Connell HS Parent
Alfred M. Lopez, Mission Resident
Ron Norlin, Mission Resident

Tough times have forced most of us to more strictly manage our personal budgets. We have learned how to make tough choices.

Now, as responsible citizens, we are also faced with difficult budgeting choices. Our beloved city is heavily in debt. And a drove of important — and not-so-important — causes are seeking money that we don’t have to spend.

I cannot support Proposition A because it stunts the growth of civic self-control — by pushing the cost of an important benefit solely upon a single class of citizens, namely property owners.

What you may not know is that San Francisco rent control does not allow residential landlords to pass on increased property taxes to tenants. As a consequence, renters are empowered to increase city expenditures, without being required to help to pay the cost.

As compelling as the physical condition of our schools may seem, it is both unreasonable and unfair that the cost of improving them should be levied against property owners, alone. Therefore, the decision to incur this expense must be deferred, until there is a method to assure that those who want to spend the money will share in both the decision to spend the money and the responsibility of repayment.

This is a tough decision. Yet, I urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition A. It’s time to forge a connection between benefits and burdens.

Merrier Turner Lightner
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This year the City is expecting a budget deficit of $100 million or more. In these difficult times we are all faced with difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the school administrators have chosen to use moneys that should have gone to maintain buildings for other purposes.

We should also question the school districts priorities in continuing to hold some of San Francisco’s prime properties. Unused assets like the vacant Grant school site in Pacific Heights, should be utilized to their highest and best use, before school officials ask us again for money. And what about the administrative building and surrounding property on Van Ness at the Civic Center? Again, this prime site needs to be evaluated for its best return on the taxpayers investment.

Before we go into debt another $95 million, $152 million with interest, the school district should make fiscally responsible decisions. It is poor fiscal practice to borrow money at high interest costs, for ongoing, regular expenses. Especially while holding such valuable assets.

Proposition A is bad fiscal policy. If they can’t make the tough decisions we can. Tell the bureaucrats to better manage our recession-restricted money by voting No on Proposition A.

David Gruber
Commissioner
San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ($95,000,000) FOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of June, 1994, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City and County a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction by the City and County of the municipal improvements hereinafter described in the amount and for the purposes stated:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facility upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

San Francisco Unified School District Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 50-94, $95,000,000

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sum of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed thereof by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

That estimate of cost as set forth in Resolution No. 50-94 is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereon received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The special election hereby called shall be held and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the General Election by the Registrar of Voters to be published in the official newspaper of the City and County on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 5. The ballots to be used at the special election shall be the ballots to be used at the General Election. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition: "SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT BONDS. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $95,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and/or reconstruction of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, including facilities upgrades, construction of new improvements, improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, removal and abatement of certain hazardous materials and related acquisition, construction or reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes."

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the Bonds shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

On absentee voter ballots, the voter to vote in favor of the proposition hereby submitted shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of the proposition, and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of the proposition. If to the extent that a numerical system is used at said special election, each voter to vote in favor of the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "YES" vote in favor of the proposition and to vote against the proposition shall punch the absentee ballot card in the hole after the number corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in the proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, payable semiannually, except that interest for the first year may be payable at the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the official newspaper of the City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of the election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of the special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COMBINED DISPATCH CENTER AND THE ACQUISITION OF RELATED EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING A COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM, FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309(a) hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation, or a similar non-profit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the City enter into lease financing arrangements with the City and County of San Francisco Lease Finance Corporation, or a similar nonprofit corporation, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of Sixty Million dollars ($60,000,000), for the purpose of constructing a combined dispatch center and acquiring related equipment, including a computer-aided dispatch system, for police, fire and emergency medical services?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates an emergency dispatch (911) system. When a person dials 911, the person is connected with an emergency operator. Depending on the type of emergency, the caller is transferred to a Police Department dispatcher, a Fire Department dispatcher, or an Emergency Medical Services (ambulance) dispatcher. The dispatchers are located in three separate buildings and use different dispatch equipment.

The Fire dispatch equipment is about 20 years old. The Police equipment is about 10 years old. The Emergency Medical Services equipment is about 5 years old.

Cities make improvements to buildings and land, and buy equipment such as emergency dispatch systems by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment, building or property and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

With certain exceptions, the City may not use lease financing without voter approval.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to use lease financing to construct a combined dispatch center for police, fire and emergency medical services and to buy new emergency dispatch equipment. This equipment would include a computer system to assist police, fire and emergency medical services dispatchers. The total owed for this lease financing could not be more than $60 million plus interest.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to use lease financing to build and equip a combined dispatch center.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the City to use lease financing for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the City enter into the proposed lease-purchase of a building and computer assisted dispatch system for police, fire and emergency medical services, based on current estimates, the total cost of the project would be no more than $60 million.

Funding for this project will be provided by fees from telephone services ($47.4 million), available bond fund proceeds ($23 million) and general fund appropriations ($10.3 million). Telephone access fees and general funds will be collected and appropriated over a period of approximately 10 years to provide funding for project costs and debt service at the rate of approximately $5.8 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 7, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.
911 Dispatch Center Financing

PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will provide a prudent, cost efficient method of financing a new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center. Included is the up-to-date computer equipment necessary for the Fire and Police Departments to respond more quickly to protect you in an emergency.

The current Fire Dispatch System is antiquated and subject to failure. The 911 and Police Dispatch systems are among the oldest still in use.

What is proposed is a new earthquake resistant response center, combining Fire Dispatch, Police Dispatch and 911 response. Provision is made to include Ambulance Dispatch in the future. Dispatch and Communications Equipment would be the most up-to-date available as selected by the Fire, Police and other Emergency forces.

The cost of the new building and necessary Computer and Communications Systems will be up to $60 Million Dollars. The City has established a small surcharge on most telephone bills which over a period of years, would pay off a preponderance of the bonds we need to issue now for the cost of the new 911 Emergency Response System and Center. Proposition B will approve this financing method.

We urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition B. This financing plan is the most feasible way to get a much needed new 911 System and Emergency Response Center built quickly so that you and our firefighters and Police Officers no longer have to depend on an outdated Emergency Response and Dispatch System.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

NO, LEASE FINANCING IS NOT THE MOST FEASIBLE WAY — ONLY THE MOST EXPENSIVE

Nobody is against upgrading the City and County of San Francisco’s 911 Emergency Dispatch.

Under Proposition B, lease financing proposal over $60 million will be borrowed at high interest. Is credit card government the best way to pay for routine police, fire, and emergency needs?

We think such programs as all should be paid out of current tax revenue — without extra credit interest being tacked on.

Lease financing is really used as a political bait and switch game. Necessary programs which can be paid by current tax revenues are placed on the ballot as lease financing proposals so current tax revenue may be used to pay for more questionable programs. Some current City Hall expenses; include paying political consultants, raises for overpaid administrators and giving public streets away without compensation to developers (e.g. Commercial Street).

Let’s send a message to City Hall. We’re tired of tax revenues being wasted. Can We afford to give Supervisors a blank check?

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlie Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

"LEASE FINANCING" EQUALS "MORE GAMES WITH TAXPAYERS MONEY"!!!

Proposition B, if passed, would permit the City to borrow another $60 million plus interest. Measure B, disguised as lease financing, is requesting voter approval for City departments to borrow another $60 million plus interest on credit. A similar ballot measure requesting only half the amount of money for department loans was defeated in the last election.

The City and County of San Francisco should BUY NEEDED EQUIPMENT.

Lease financing allows City departments to buy equipment on credit, thus running up MORE LONG-TERM COSTS FOR THE CITY.

Many of the BUREAUCRATS running our City departments would have trouble balancing their own personal check books: DO YOU REALLY WANT THOSE "CREATIVE" CITY BUREAUCRATS TO RUN THE TOWN $60 MILLION MORE INTO DEBT???

Citizens Against Endless Tax Increases
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman
Ilene Hernandez
Candidate for Democratic Central Committee
John Riordan
Past San Francisco College Board President

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

We believe that the citizens of San Francisco need and deserve a reliable, fully integrated 911 Police, Fire, and Emergency Dispatch Center. We believe that our firefighters and police officers deserve to be supported by a fast and reliable dispatch system.

Importantly, we believe that we and they deserve it NOW! The opponents apparently disagree. The fact is that there is no practical way to pay for this major building and communications project on a "pay as you go" basis and still have it available for our citizens and crime and fire fighting forces in a timely manner. It would take many years for the minor telephone service fee to accumulate the money necessary to pay for it all at once. To accept the opponents' arguments to do so, we would have to wait for years to get our new 911 System in place.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will support our ability to move forward immediately on the new 911 Emergency Dispatch Center by doing what most of us as individuals or business people do as a matter of course; paying off major investments over a period of time.

Do not delay the new 911/Fire-Police-Emergency Dispatch Center.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is an investment in saving lives and property. 911 failed during the Loma Prieta earthquake. It will fail again unless it is located in an earthquake safe building. San Francisco’s 911 problems can’t be solved with a band-aid. The tragedy last July at 101 California is a painful example of the importance of a reliable 911 system. We must invest in new technology and modern planning to guarantee a reliable 911. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

Our antiquated emergency response system has failed to protect public safety, with tragic results.
Your life and the lives of your family, friends and neighbors could literally depend on Proposition B.
Please join me in voting YES on B.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

As chair of the City’s Public Safety committee, I strongly urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition B.
Our investigation last year showed how these outdated systems endanger your safety. Proposition B will provide for long-overdue upgrades. Please join me in voting YES on B for a safer city.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
PROPOSITION C

Shall the City's aggregate principal debt limit for the lease financing of equipment without voter approval be increased from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000, with the limit thereafter increased by five percent each year?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Cities buy equipment such as computers and cars by 1) paying for them all at once, or 2) leasing them until paid for. The second method is called "lease financing." A nonprofit corporation created for this purpose buys the equipment and borrows money to pay for it. Cities then lease it from the corporation, paying back the principal plus interest in installments.

The City Charter allows equipment to be lease financed without voter approval if the total principal owed for all such equipment leases does not exceed a specified limit, currently $23 million. This limit goes up 5% each year.

The City now owes more than $21 million in equipment lease finance agreements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing. The City could lease finance equipment without voter approval if the total principal owed did not exceed $40 million. This limit would go up 5% each year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the City's debt limit for equipment lease financing to $40 million.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, if the proposed charter amendment is adopted and implemented, it will increase the amount of City debt service and lease purchase costs by an amount dependent upon the amount of new obligations undertaken. If the entire $20 million additional authorization were obligated for one project at current rates, financing costs would amount to approximately $1 million per year.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Hallinan.
PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Your "YES" vote on Proposition C would extend a successful lease financing program authorized by the voters as Proposition "C" in June of 1990.

This voter approved Proposition allowed us to establish a non-profit Lease Financing Corporation to lease purchase the City's equipment at rates cheaper than what is available in the private market. A limit of $20 million was placed on the Corporation at that time and increases by 5% a year.

Since 1990, the City has used the Lease Finance Corporation to acquire major equipment, primarily Fire Trucks, Police Vehicles, Ambulances, Hospital Equipment and Computers. By using this tax exempt financing method, we have been able to buy more of this kind of equipment than would otherwise have been possible.

We are now within sight of the limit and need your authority to continue this successful, money saving program.

Proposition C would increase the limit on our non-profit Leasing Corporation's debt to $40 million, plus 5% per year. This would allow us to continue to upgrade the major equipment needs of our Police, Fire and Health Departments at the lowest possible cost.

PLEASE VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

DO YOU WANT TO DOUBLE AN ALREADY GEOMETRICALLY EXPANDING "CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT" CANCER??

Already expanding geometrically at 5% per year, the so-called "successful lease financing program" is really just over-priced San Francisco "credit card government" at its worst.

Now, with Proposition C, we are faced with a proposal to DOUBLE the equipment lease-financing credit cancer!!!

To refer to equipment lease-financing as a "money saving program" is FRAUD on its face. Were the members of the Board of Supervisors to make such a false representation in a prospectus to sell stocks or bonds, the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) would immediately bring a lawsuit.

Credit costs San Francisco taxpayers' money: Cash that cannot be used for needed government fire, police, hospital, or computer services.

The City and County of San Francisco, up to its ears in debt, needs to start paying down on its present obligations.

Current San Francisco equipment needs should be paid for out of current tax money. Financing and interest charges should be avoided.

If you really want to achieve "the lowest possible cost" — VOTE "NO" ON MONEY-WAISTING PROPOSITION C!!!

Citizens Opposed To Proposition C
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ario Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committeeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeewoman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE "NO" ON "FUNNY-MONEY" PROPOSITION C

In recent years the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has become increasingly addicted to using so-called "Equipment Lease-Financing" and other "funny-money" credit devices to pay for routine City Government expenses.

Equipment Lease-Financing needs to be halted — not expanded — as this unwise proposed City Charter amendment allows.

Equipment Lease-Financing is just an expensive way to "anticipate" local tax revenues at great additional expense to the City and County of San Francisco.

Added long-term costs and reduced long-term product values are the natural results of "credit card government" with Equipment Lease-Financing.

Regular City Government expenses should be paid for out of tax funds as received.

The virtual bankruptcy of New York City in the mid-1970's was the logical result of using local bonds and other credit "games" to pay for the normal needs of a community.

Bad business practices are bad business practices.

Equipment Lease-Financing is a bad business practice.

San Francisco already has a huge bonded indebtedness — we certainly do not need more "funny-money" credit games to further run up our costs.

Vote "NO" on Equipment Lease-Financing.

Vote "NO" on Proposition C.

Also vote "NO" on related Proposition B.

Citizens Opposed to Proposition C

Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Nominee

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

Max Woods
Past Republican Committee man

John Riordan
Past College Board President

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committee Member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Lease financing of major items of equipment is a common business practice. It allows for the acquisition of major pieces of equipment which have a longer useful life and pays for them over time. What is good business practice in the private sector is good business practice in the public sector as well.

Most of the equipment the City has lease financed through the existing authorization are Police cars, Fire trucks and major medical equipment for San Francisco General Hospital. All of these lease financed purchases are approved by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

If Proposition C were rejected, the City's ability to use its non-profit leasing corporation for future lease financings would be severely constrained for a number of years. Thus, much needed equipment would either not be acquired at all or lease financed through the private commercial market at a much higher interest rate than is available through our public non-profit leasing corporation.

Proposition C saves money in the lease financing of equipment as compared to what such transactions cost in the private market.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is another attempt by San Francisco's public officials to avoid hard choices. It would enable the Board of Supervisors to add another $20,000,000 to our public debt. Our taxes pay off city debts; we have a right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

The issue of a public voice on all debt measures has been with us since passage of a Charter amendment to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and "lease financing" plans. Now is the time to stand up against public indebtedness and vote no on Proposition C.

Under current law, the city is allowed to lease-finance $20,000,000 worth of equipment purchases. Proposition C would double this amount to $40,000,000. $21,345,000 of San Francisco's current debt is the result of this scheme, where non-profit corporations issue tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then lease the facility or equipment back to the city. This is a no-interest loan and taxpayers pick up the tab. We aren't prepared to have this debt doubled by the propaganda of this contrivance!

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don't let the Board of Supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It's our money and our vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson
Director

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

DEscribing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the city and county of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending section 7.309 thereof relating to the financing of the acquisition of equipment.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 7.309 thereof to read as follows:

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purpose of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Park Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20,000,000, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year in the year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City be required to employ a minimum of 1,971 full duty police officers, with an emphasis on assigning officers to neighborhood policing and patrol?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no law setting a minimum number of police officers; the number of officers is set through the City’s budget process. Each year the Police Commission, which is appointed by the Mayor, proposes a budget for the Police Department. This budget includes salaries and benefits for a specified number of officers. The Mayor or the Board of Supervisors can reduce the number of officers in the proposed budget.

Police officers who are fully able to perform police duties are called full duty officers. Officers who have been injured or are unable to perform all police duties are called light duty officers.

As of March 1, 1994 there were 1,695 full duty officers and 128 light duty officers. In addition there were 48 recruits in the Police Academy, and the City planned to hire 50 experienced officers from outside the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment that would require a minimum number of police officers. Beginning June 30, 1995, the police force would always be required to have at least 1,971 full duty officers. The number of full duty police officers now assigned to neighborhood policing and patrol could never be reduced. Beginning July 1, 1994, all new police officers would be assigned to neighborhood policing, patrol and investigations.

Each year the Police Commission would have to decide how many Police Department jobs could be filled by civilians in order to increase the number of police officers on the street.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it would increase the cost of government, based on 1993-94 staffing and salary levels of the Police Department, by at least a range of $13.8 to $17.3 million depending upon the number of light duty police officers being returned to full duty. These amounts could increase or decrease in future years with changes in salary rates and benefits granted Police Officers.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On January 31, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Bierman and Hallinan.
Police Staffing

PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

Proposition D puts more police on our streets and creates safer neighborhoods, with no increases in taxes.

San Franciscans don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. We cannot continue to tolerate a seriously understaffed police department.

Our Police Department is 535 officers below the national average. Needed crime prevention programs have been cut. This is good news for criminals and bad news for the rest of us. *Our city's violent crime rate is the highest in the state, up almost 12 percent.*

We must maximize police presence in our neighborhoods.

Ten years ago, the staffing level was set at 1971 officers. But the Department has been operating with less than 1,800 officers, jeopardizing public safety.

Proposition D creates a charter amendment mandating that the Department be brought up to full strength and kept there.

Money for more police is available without increasing taxes.

Last year voters passed Proposition 172, giving the City $44 Million dollars per year to spend on public safety.

None of this money has been used to hire more police officers!

Voters deserve to have this money spent fighting crime. Proposition D will cost $13.8 million to $17.3 million to implement full police staffing. That's only a third of the funds available from Proposition 172.

Vote YES on Proposition D to ensure that Proposition 172 money is used to hire at least 200 more officers for community policing, patrols and investigations — not desk jobs. More police officers on our streets will be a visible deterrent to crime.

This Charter Amendment has support from neighborhood groups, district merchants and other concerned citizens from every corner of this city — and your Board of Supervisors — who want to make the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone.

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D**

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

Don't Be Fooled! Vote No on Proposition D!

If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors really want to put more police on the streets, they could do it now without Proposition D! Proposition D does not guarantee more police on our streets. It does, however, continue to make government unresponsive to changes that are urgently needed to make our City work.

Proposition D will increase costs without regard to getting our money's worth! The enormous cost of this measure — millions of dollars — will come from the City's general fund at the expense of many other worthwhile services. Don't kid yourselves — this is not a free ride!

There are no excess monies from Proposition 172 to pay the $17.3 million necessary to carry out Proposition D. All available monies from Proposition 172 have been used to offset statewide property tax loss to cities and counties.

As wise voters, we would never write the number of soldiers in the military in the Constitution. As wise voters, we must streamline our Charter to make government provide City services cost-effective. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. We deserve Charter Reform not arbitrary and expensive charter manipulation!

*Esther Marks*

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

In November, voters directed the City to streamline our Charter to make government cost effective and responsive. Writing police staffing levels into the Charter is the exact opposite. Let’s give Charter reform a chance! Vote NO on Proposition D.

Tony Kilroy
Pamela Ayo Yetunde
Jean Kortum
Michael Nolan
Eileen Collins
Neil Gendel
Esther Marks
Dan Dillon
Sue Bierman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is a very simple charter amendment that does a very important thing: it puts more police on our streets. By adding 10-12 beat cops to each district, we will be safer in our homes, stores, and neighborhoods.

Your government has a basic commitment to protect the safety and security of its citizens. Nearly 15 years ago, the city set a minimum staffing level of 1,971 police officers. That commitment has never been met.

Fighting crime must be one of our top priorities; we need more police for our neighborhood patrolling. This charter amendment gives us the authority to help fight crime with a fully staffed police force.

Last November, Californians voted for Proposition 172, a dedicated revenue source for public safety. $44 million was directed to our city coffers by the voters for permanent public safety enhancements. Proposition D ensures that at least a portion of those dollars will go where we voted to send them.

Opponents will argue Proposition D is bad fiscal policy because it sets a rigid police staffing level.

They are wrong.

It simply sets a minimum level we should never fall below. The Board of Supervisors still retains police staffing discretion above that number. Two hundred more police officers on our streets will be a strong, visible deterrent to crime.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.
Let’s set our priorities straight!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We are currently short of our Charter mandated number of 1,972 police officers.
This shortage not only affects the safety of our citizens, and the services that they rightly deserve but also presents additional officer safety for the Cop on the street.
Voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 172 in November of 1993 which mandated $44 million to the City of San Francisco to be directed towards public safety. Now is the opportune time to bring our Department back to full strength.
Our citizens deserve it!!
Our officers deserve it!!
The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association supports “Citizens for Safer Streets” in their efforts to legislatively assure adequate protection for all of San Francisco. We urge a Yes Vote for the Police Full Staffing Measure.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

As co-author of this charter amendment, I realize this is the only way the Police Department will be brought up to a staffing level that will sufficiently protect the people of San Francisco.
Adding 200 officers to neighborhood patrols will only take 1/3 of the money we get annually from Prop. 172 — money that voters wanted spent to improve public safety.
I was outraged that no money from Prop. 172 was used to hire more police officers. Express your outrage at the ballot box and vote YES on Prop. D.

Supervisor Bill Maher

A fully staffed police force — along with active involvement of residents, merchants and city officials — is vital to preventing crime and violence in our neighborhoods.
Proposition D won’t raise taxes. But it will make sure that City Hall gets its priorities straight.
Please join me in voting YES on D.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

The San Francisco Police Department has not been fully staffed since 1983. Because the Department is currently 200 short, the gang task force, the vice detail, community policing, and walking beat cops have been virtually eliminated.
The “prime” responsibility of Government is to “protect” its citizenry — Full Force Funding is a basic right for all — it’s a priority.
Vote yes on Proposition D.

Calle22

The Independent Grocers Association urges you to vote YES on PROP D.
Every business in every neighborhood knows how reassuring it is to have a beat cop walk into your business. We have lost our beat cops.
This charter amendment will make sure that we have officers patrolling in the neighborhoods.
This is the way to get more police officers without raising our taxes.
The money comes from the state sales tax that we already pay.
We urge you to vote YES on PROP D. For the safety of our families and businesses.

Zuheir Erakat
Independent Grocers Association

Justice for Murder Victims supports the full staffing of the San Francisco Police Department because it will mean more police officers on the streets to protect us from those who commit violent crimes.
San Francisco has the highest rate of violent crime in the state. Meanwhile our staffing levels continually decrease. We need more officers to protect our citizens from violent crime.
We urge you to vote YES ON PROP D.

Harriet Salerno
Founder — Justice for Murder Victims
Cristine Mack
Member
Helga D’Arcy
Member
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We, the Richmond District Merchants Associations & Residents support wholeheartedly the “FULL FORCE FUNDING” initiative. Your vote can make a difference — Vote for more patrol officers, safer streets, less violent crime, more drug arrests, and cleaner neighborhoods, — support “FULL FORCE FUNDING” for San Francisco. Let’s make sure Prop. 172 funds are used to bring the police department up to full strength and keep it maintained at that level of 1971 officers not 1750, as it is today. Let’s make San Francisco a safer, greater place to live, work, & visit. “CARPE DIEM.”

George M. Patterson
President, Greater Geary Merchants Assoc., Inc.
Realto, The Prudential California Realty
Vice-President, Superior Business Services, Inc.

Designate your Tax Dollars for Public Safety.
More Cops, no new taxes.
Vote YES on Proposition D.

Ron Norlin
Mission District Residents for Safer Streets

Citizens attending monthly meetings of the Richmond District Community Police Forum have expressed increasing concern about assaults, rapes, gang activity and murders on our streets. Although an escalating violent crime rate is argument enough for a fully-staffed police department, a host of additional complaints about our city’s deteriorating lifestyle would also be answered by hiring more police officers.

Our community has learned from bitter experience that leaving the critical matter of providing for more police staffing at the discretion of elected public officials is both naive and foolish.

We are long overdue for a charter amendment that compels the city to better ensure our safety through full force funding of the police department.

Paul von Beroldingen & Tom Field
Co-Founders
Richmond Community Police Forum

My company has been in San Francisco since 1877. Our twenty-five employees now live in fear of car theft, burglary and worse. Our building is defaced daily. There is garbage everywhere. WE NEED BEAT COPS. If we do not get help soon, we (and lots of other businesses) will be forced to move.

Jack Bethards
Schoenstein and Co.

The staffing level of the Police in San Francisco is 225 officers below the national average for cities and 515 officers below the average for the ten largest cities.

Public safety is good business for San Francisco. Proposition D ensures that the 225 officers that are hired will be used for neighborhood policing without any increase in taxes.

Vote yes on Prop. D.

JP Gillen, President
Noo Valley Merchants and Professionals Assoc.
Owner, Little Italy Restaurant

Our opponents are right! We should not have to put police staffing in the charter, but the City has promised us more beat cops for 15 years and has never delivered. The latest slap in the face is the use of Prop. 172 funds for everything but beat cops! Visible police presence is the most immediate way to curb the crime, vandalism and filth that is killing our city. Vote Yes on Prop. D.

Al Fernandez
CAL WATCH
Mission District
Business Neighborhood Watch Group

With police on patrol I would feel safe again. Now I am afraid to leave home because my house might be burglarized! My car is not safe. When parked it is subject to burglary and vandalism, when driving it is subject to carjacking.

Vote YES for more police patrols.

Diane Delu
Sunset Resident

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition “D” insures a constant level of public safety resources for San Francisco.
Citizens deserve and our tourist industry demands a visible, fully staffed police force.
This measure ensures proper allocation of funds, not new taxes.

Susan Horsfall

Nothing is more essential to San Franciscans than public safety. That is why I co-authored this critical “Full Force” Charter Amendment.
When citizens passed Proposition 172, thereby earmarking tax monies for public safety, they sent a clear message that public safety was their top concern. This Charter Amendment will ensure that Proposition 172 monies are appropriately spent on public safety. It commits to funding the police department at the “Full Force” of 1,971 sworn officers.

I strongly urge you to vote for this Charter Amendment. A “Full Force” means a safer San Francisco.

Supervisor Annemarie Conroy

Proposition D will ensure that the voters get the public safety they voted for when they passed Proposition 172.
The number of police on the streets has gone down in the last ten years while crime has increased. RAD (Residents Against Druggies) was formed not of desire but necessity. RAD is a group of residents from the Haight that patrol their own streets in the hope of stopping violence. Government has failed us when we have to patrol our streets because of insufficient policing.
Don’t let your safety be jeopardized.
Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Joe Konopka, President
RAD

Neighborhood policing and patrols necessitates FULL FORCE FUNDING for 1,971 Police Officers.
To safeguard our neighborhoods vote YES on Proposition D.

Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods

San Franciscans for Safer Streets
Ilene Hernandez, Member, Civic Alliance
Alexa Smith, Member, Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner, Past County Chairman, SF Republican Party
Andrew Solow, Member Mayor’s Mission Task Force
Thomas Garber, SF Apartment Association
George Michael Patterson, President, Greater Geary Merchants
Marion Aird, League of SF Neighbors
Ron Norlin
Glenda Powell
Krista Huntsman
Michael & Barbara Russell

Prop. 172 funds (1/2 cent sales tax) were intended to go to Public Safety. The Board of Supervisor’s decided not to direct these funds to Police Services as the voters had requested.
We must now mandate that the Board of Supervisors, through a Charter Amendment, increase the Police Department staffing level to a minimum of 1971 officers, maintain this level as a minimum and do so by June of 1995. It will not cost us any more money.
Furthermore, the Charter Amendment will put the additional officers where their needed most, on our streets!
Public Safety is the #1 priority of the majority of people surveyed recently. This statement can’t become a political interpretation. You can take this issue out of the hands of Politicians by a yes vote for safer streets in San Francisco.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants & Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The San Francisco Republican Party believes that the first duty of the local government is to provide public protection. The majority of San Francisco voters agree.

That's why virtually all Judges appointed by Republican Governors have won election in San Francisco, why Frank Jordan was elected Mayor, why the Aggressive Panhandling Ordinance passed (even in the Tenderloin), and why 63% of San Franciscans supported State Proposition 172 (which earmarks state sales tax monies to be used for public safety purposes).

Unfortunately, most of our elective officials have seen fit to cut police staffing by 10% in the past ten years while the incidence of violent crime in the City has increased by 26% during the same period. That's why the Police Staffing Charter Amendment is necessary.

The monies provided by Proposition 172 have already been set aside. That issue is settled. We must use those monies to bring our Police Department to full-strength and for other public safety purposes, or we face the likelihood that the monies will be returned to the State. The choice is ours.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

The San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Arthur Bruzzone          Roberta Boomer
Christopher L. Bowman   Donald A. Casper
Albert Chang            Rose Chung
Lee Dolson              James E. Gilleran
Anna M. Guth            Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama            Harold Hoagian
John Sidline            Joanne "Jody" Stevens
Marc Wolin              Charles J. Wong
Lee B. Vanderveld

We join neighborhood leaders from all corners of San Francisco and urge you to vote "Yes" on Prop. D.

San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Matthew Rothschild

Proposition D is a fiscally sensible proposal to make San Francisco safer. Proposition D uses funds already approved by the voters to bring our police department up to full staffing. I urge all San Franciscans to join me in voting YES on D.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

In 1993 the people passed Proposition 172, The Public Safety Act. As a result our city was allocated 44 Million dollars from the state, to be used for Public Safety.

This public mandate has been ignored with approximately 4/5ths of the money diverted elsewhere.

Nothing is more vital than public safety, therefore we must take action to guarantee these funds are used for that purpose.

This charter amendment will bring our Police Department to it's full strength with 200 more officers to patrol our neighborhoods with no increase in taxes. In the best interest of our city and for your own safety please vote yes.

Harry J. Aleo
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

DON'T HANCDUFF S.F.'S ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

Approved by nine members of the Board of Supervisors, this glib bit of derangement of our city's Charter trivializes that grand document by writing into it a clause which establishes forever 1,971 as the number of full duty police officers of the San Francisco Police Department.

A charter is a constitution, devoted to broad policy principles and containing powers, duties and limitations upon power. It is an enabling document, authorizing the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to implement its general policies by ordinance and/or resolution.

Proposition D sets the number of police officers at 1,971, not 1,970 or 1,972, but 1,971. It thereby locks police department personnel into a staffing number which, five years from now, or perhaps 20 years from now may be entirely irrelevant to the needs or the ability of San Franciscans to sustain themselves.

Currently, as part of the budget process, the Mayor proposes the level of funding consistent with desired staffing of the Police Department — and every other city department. The Board of Supervisors is empowered to adopt such budget ordinance and staffing provisions.

If 1,971 officers is in the public interest, why haven't our Mayor and Supervisors provided such staffing in this year's annual budget ordinance, last year's budget ordinance (or the year before) and why isn't it already a "given" for the 1994-1995 budget ordinance of the City and County which will be adopted in June? "Proposition D is a way for Supervisors and the Mayor to avoid accountability.

VOTE NO ON PROP D: WE NEED FLEXIBILITY TO MEET OUR CITY'S NEEDS: NOT IRONCLAD EARMARKS HARD TO CHANGE!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Kenneth Cera

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on D. There is no reason to believe that more bodies on the police force will make us any safer. The police force needs to better use the resources it already has.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Stop the political grandstanding on the crime issue. These Pete Wilson wannabes want you to approve a $200 million dollar budget buster. Just say and Vote No!

David C. Spero

This is a fiscally irresponsible, expensive scheme placed on the ballot by Supervisors who wish to exploit legitimate concerns about crime to get elected mayor.

There is no documentation in the legislative record that we need 200 more police officers and a $17.3 million increase in the police department's budget in one year.

San Francisco has 2.5 police officers for every 1,000 residents compared to 1.5 for San Jose, 1.7 for San Diego, 1.9 for Oakland, and 2.4 for Los Angeles.

Implementation of this measure will lead to cuts in direct neighborhood services.

Throwing money at a problem is not the solution. Better management that focuses on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency should be the first priority.

Mandating an arbitrary staffing figure is bad public policy. Vote No on D.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition D is not the way to provide more police officers. It locks an arbitrary number into the Charter at a cost of as much as $17.3 million.

Proposition D will take away general fund monies from critical services like health, drug prevention, and youth facilities. In addition to its $17.3 million pricetag, Proposition D increases costs for courts, prosecutors, defense, and sheriff.

The Charter is not meant to spell out this type of detail. Such measures should be legislated in the annual budget by the very elected officials who now support Proposition D.

Proposition D makes it impossible to achieve efficiencies in police services through strong management and new technologies, and it encourages featherbedding.

With our City facing massive budget deficits, flexibility is needed, not irrefutable, increased personnel costs.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco needs a full force police department. That fact is not in dispute. The question is, why does it have to be spelled out in the city Charter? The Mayor and Board of Supervisors can make the decision right now to fully fund the SFPD. In fact, this year the Supervisors approved funds for 100 new police officers — and they did it without a Charter amendment. They can do it again.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Now, your elected representatives are looking for an easy way out of their responsibilities to set priorities and allocate resources. Decisions about how many employees are required to provide adequate service should be made as the need arises. Adding such requirements to the Charter locks the city into providing specific services, making it difficult to respond to changing circumstances and competing needs for scarce public funding. Such mandates constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and dilute the accountability of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. It’s just bad government.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy. We urge Mayor Jordan and the Board of Supervisors to say yes to public safety and to bring the SFPD up to full staffing. And we urge them to do it now. We don’t need another Charter amendment.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition D will waste $1.5 million a year. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors wanted to reduce violent crime they would demand a change of priorities.

Do we need:
• clerical officers at $75,000 a year each?
• police providing parking and crowd control at sporting events?
• police bodyguards for President Clinton and Governor Wilson at campaign fund-raisers?
• narc busting marijuana users, dealers and people with AIDS?
• jails crowded with non-violent offenders?
• cops ticketing skateboarders, Deadheads and unlicensed street vendors?
• vice cops arresting hookers and gamblers?
• police arresting peaceful political protesters and people who give away food without a license?
• police committing illegal searches and seizures?
Proposition D won’t make our streets safer; it will only expand the police state.

George L. O’Brien, Chairman
San Francisco Libertarian Party

Mark Valverde
Libertarian for State Senate, 8th district

Mark Read Pickens
Libertarian for Assembly, 13th district

Anton Sherwood
Libertarian for Assembly, 12th district

In 1978 we voted to spend no city funds on enforcement of the marijuana laws. Since that date over 50,000 persons have been arrested. In 1991 80% of us voted to legalize medical marijuana. Since that date 8,000 persons have been arrested for marijuana. Millions have been spent. Lives have been destroyed. The jails are filled with innocent people. When will this agony end?

Let’s put this money toward helping people. Let us show the nation how to make peace in our society. We will all be safer and feel better about ourselves.

VOTE NO!

Dennis Peron
Director, Americans for Compassionate Use.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to establish and maintain a minimum staffing level of police officers for the City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 3.531-1 to read as follows:

NOTE: The entire section is new.

3.531-1 MINIMUM POLICE STAFFING LEVEL
(a) Not later than June 30, 1995, the police force of the City and County shall at all times consist of not fewer than 1,971 full duty sworn officers. The staffing level of the San Francisco Police Department shall be maintained with a minimum of 1,971 full duty sworn officers thereafter.
(b) All officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco are directed to take all acts necessary to implement the provisions of this section. The board of supervisors is empowered to adopt ordinances necessary to effectuate the purpose of this section including but not limited to ordinances regulating the scheduling of police training classes.
(c) Further the San Francisco Police Commission shall initiate an annual review to civilize as many positions as possible to maximize police presence in the communities and submit that report to the Board of Supervisors annually for review and approval.
(d) The number of full duty sworn officers in the Police Department dedicated to neighborhood policing and patrol for fiscal year 1993 – 1994 shall not be reduced in future years, and all new full duty sworn officers authorized for the Police Department beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995 shall also be dedicated to neighborhood community policing, patrol and investigations.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:
We, the undersigned, registered and qualified voters of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Section 3 of Article XI of the California Constitution and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 34450) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request the following proposed amendment to the charter of this city and county be submitted to the registered and qualified voters of the city and county for their adoption or rejection at an election on a date to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

The proposed charter amendment reads as follows:
San Francisco Charter Section 6.416
LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND
(a) There is hereby established a fund for libraries, which shall be called the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund and shall be maintained separate and apart from all other city and county funds and appropriated by annual or supplemental appropriation pursuant to sections 6.205 and 6.306 of this charter. Monies therein shall be expended or used exclusively by the library department specified in section 3.560 of the charter, solely to provide library services and materials and to operate library facilities in accordance with this section.
(b) So long as the Library Preservation Fund exists as provided in this section, the following requirements shall apply:
(1) The library department shall operate no fewer than 26 branch libraries, a main library, and a library facility for the blind (which may be at a branch or main library).
(2) Not later than November 1, 1994, at least one public hearing shall be held at the main and each branch library, which at least one library commissioner shall attend and which shall receive the results of a survey of users’ preferences as to the facility’s operating hours.
(3) Following these public hearings, effective no later than January 1, 1995, the library commission shall establish service hours for the main and each branch library, which shall not be reduced during the five years beginning January 1, 1995. Total annual average service hours shall be at least 1028 hours per week (that is, a level approximating the total service hours during fiscal year 1986 – 1987).
(4) The public hearing process specified in subsection (2) shall be repeated at five year intervals, being completed not later than November 1 of the year in question.
(5) Following these subsequent public hearings, the library commission may modify the individual and aggregate service hours established under subsection (3), for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2000 or January 1, 2005 respectively, based on a comprehensive assessment of needs and the adequacy of library resources.
Increasing library hours throughout the system and acquiring books and materials shall receive priority in appropriating and expending fund monies to the extent the funds are not needed to meet the preceding requirements of this subsection (b). Any requirement of this subsection may be modified to the extent made necessary by a fire, earthquake, or other event which renders compliance with the requirement impracticable.
(c) There is hereby set aside for the San Francisco Library Preservation Fund, from the revenues of the tax levy pursuant to section 6.208 of this charter, revenues in an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two-and-one-half cents ($0.025) for each one hundred dollars ($100.00) of assessed valuation for each of the fifteen fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1994 – 1995. The treasurer shall set aside and maintain said amount, together with any interest earned thereon, in said fund, and any amounts unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the charter, shall be appropriated then or thereafter solely for the purposes specified in this section. Said fund shall be in addition to any other funds set aside for libraries.
(d) The fund shall be used to increase the aggregate City appropriations and expenditures for services, materials and operation of facilities provided by the library department. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of City appropriations for the library department (not including appropriations from the Library Preservation Fund) in any of the fifteen years during which funds are required to be set aside under this section below the amount so appropriated, including appropriations from the San Francisco Children’s Fund pursuant to section 6.415 of the charter and including all supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1992 – 1993, adjusted as provided below. Said base amount shall be adjusted for each fiscal year after 1992 – 1993 based on calculations consistent from year to year, by the percentage increase or decrease in aggregate City appropriations for all purposes from the base year as estimated by the Controller. Errors in the Controller’s estimate of appropriations for a fiscal year shall be corrected by adjustment in the next year’s estimate. For purposes of this subsection, (i) aggregate City appropriations shall not include funds granted to the City by private agencies or appropriated by other public agencies and received by the City, and (ii) library department appropriations shall not include funds appropriated to the library department to pay for services of other City departments or agencies, except for departments or agencies for whose services the library department was appropriated funds in fiscal year 1993 – 1994. Within ninety days following the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2008 – 2009, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations for the library department.
(e) If any provision of this section, or its application to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this section and its applications shall not be affected; every provision of this section is intended to be severable.
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to maintain funding for the Library Department at a level no lower than that for the 1992 - 93 fiscal year, and to establish a Library Preservation Fund, to be used only for additional library services, by placing a certain amount of property tax revenues in that fund annually, and shall the City be required to keep open a main and 26 branch libraries for a specified minimum number of hours each week?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The amount of money the City spends for public libraries is set each year through the budget process. The City is not required to spend a particular amount of money on libraries. The City does not have to keep open a specific number of branch libraries or to have libraries open a specific number of hours each week.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, for the next 15 years, the City would have to spend at least as much for libraries as it did in fiscal year 1992-93. The City would also have to use a specific percentage of its property tax revenues for a Library Preservation Fund. The Fund could only be used to increase spending for library operation, services and materials.

During the term of the Fund, the Library would have to operate a main library and at least 26 branch libraries, including a library for the blind.

After public hearings, the Library Commission would set the hours that the main library and each branch are open. From 1995 through 1999, Proposition E specifies the average number of hours libraries must be open per week. After 1999, the Library Commission could change the average number of hours libraries must remain open, after holding public hearings and based on a study of needs and the adequacy of library services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to establish these funding and service requirements for libraries.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

If the proposed charter amendment is adopted, in my opinion, it would mandate the current level of spending on library services ($20.8 million) plus reallocate funds (an additional $13.7 million in 1994-95) from current city services to expand specific library services as set forth in the measure, for a total funding commitment of approximately $34 million in 1994-95 with escalation factors in future years.

To the extent property tax revenues would be shifted to library programs, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

Between 1994-95 and 2009-10, these dedicated funds would grow in two ways: The base $20.8 million would be increased by the general percentage increase in all City appropriations; the $13.7 million of additional funding would grow based on the increase in assessed values of City properties.

How "E" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition E to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

42,503 valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot. This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the petition was first filed with the Registrar.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 23, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco’s neighborhood libraries are in danger of closing because politicians are looting library budgets to pay for pet projects, robbing our children of safe havens to learn and take refuge from increasingly dangerous streets.

Proposition E will save San Francisco’s neighborhood library branches. This charter amendment guarantees a small portion of the budget goes to keeping our 26 branch libraries open.

City Hall has ravaged our public library system. For a decade, book budgets were slashed, library hours cut and branch closures threatened. Demand for library services has increased, but resources have diminished. Every year, politicians take money from the libraries and make it harder for our children to improve themselves and ensure their futures.

The Charter Amendment is direct democracy. We the citizens will set our government’s priorities. We say that libraries are a priority, and we will not allow libraries — and our children — to become victims of the budget process, merely receiving the crumbs remaining after the special interests are finished.

The Library Preservation Fund guarantees:
• a minimum of 26 neighborhood branches;
• a dramatic increase in the number of hours for these branches, back to 1985/86 levels;
• money for a respectable book budget;
• a library for the blind;
• the main library;
• much needed services for the children of San Francisco.

The Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It simply guarantees that a small portion of the budget — less than 2 percent — be spent for libraries.

Just this much will save branches, buy books and increase hours. Libraries are more than books, more than buildings — they are the glue that holds our society and our neighborhoods together. Vote yes on Proposition E.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco neighborhood libraries are in no danger of closure. No one in the Office of the Mayor, the city administration or on the Board of Supervisors has advocated such a drastic step, nor will they.

The truth is that we have a Library Commission committed to keeping neighborhood libraries open through good management, and various city departments and the Office of the Mayor have developed numerous strategies and plans to enhance the services of neighborhood libraries and expand their hours.

To vote for this proposition will flood the library system with unneeded funds which will come from already financially strapped departments such as the Health Department, Recreation and Parks, and various public safety agencies such as police and fire.

Do not be misled by language stating that Proposition E is not a tax increase. In fact, it is a raid on the general fund with no thought for good government or what is best for the city overall. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

I strongly urge a NO vote on Proposition E.
Put simply, it is bad government.
It would mandate that a fixed percentage of the general fund be set
aside each year for libraries. If it passes today, it would double the
libraries’ budget from $17 million to approximately $33 million.
In practical terms this arbitrary and binding dollar increase trans-
lates into:
• Closure of eight district police stations and cancellation of plans
to hire 100 new police offers, OR
• Elimination of 20 percent of the city’s bus service, including all
night bus service, OR
• Elimination of all nine of the city’s health centers and elimina-
tion of outpatient services at San Francisco General Hospital,
OR
• Eliminate all adult recreation programs offered by the Recre-
tion and Parks Department and eliminating maintenance at
Golden Gate Park or all neighborhood parks
Proposition E would force your elected officials to make choices
that would reduce essential services and safety in the city. No one
can deny that libraries are important to this city and I am committed
to keeping all branches open, and to finding ways to increase
service. That is a commitment I will keep.
But, I implore the voters not to tie my hands and the hands of the
Board of Supervisors with this fiscally destructive Proposition.
If this passes, then advocates of the city services such as police
or parks will put similar measures on the ballot and create budget-
ary chaos of unprecedented proportions.
Follow common sense. Vote NO on Proposition E.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Mr. Mayor, the Police Department’s budget is almost $200
million, there are 10 district stations, and you’re going to close 8 if
Proposition E passes and gives libraries $10 million? You’ve got a
thing or two to learn about “good government”.
Adequate police staffing, quality health care, and clean parks are
important, but so are libraries. It’s not enough to promise you’ll
keep them open when you’re unwilling to provide sufficient fund-
ing for books, librarians and a standard number of hours.
Since you’ve been mayor, the library budget has declined over
$1 million, and you might cut it another $1.7 million. Our busiest
branches — which used to be open 55 hours per week — are now
open only 34, others, just 18.
In 1988, San Francisco voted overwhelmingly to build a new
Main Library and renovate branches. In 1990, we voted to renovate
more branches. Over 13,000 San Franciscans have contributed
more than $29 million to complete and enhance those projects. San
Franciscans want libraries to be a priority. That’s why over 67,500
voters signed petitions to put Proposition E on the ballot. The
people are keeping faith with the library. You have not.
Empty rhetoric won’t work, the library budget is headed in the
wrong direction. Proposition E demands clear priorities and better
management. The sky won’t fall if Proposition E passes. It’s
unfortunate and inappropriate to claim otherwise.
Yes on Proposition E. Guarantee full funding for neighborhood
libraries.

Diane Filippi
Chair, Save San Francisco’s Public Libraries
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As law enforcement officials for the City and County of San Francisco, we strongly endorse the Library Charter Amendment.

It is critical that our youth have alternatives to street life and crime. The libraries have always been a key alternative, a safe haven from crime and a refuge from drugs.

When the library budget is cut, so are the hours for neighborhood libraries. When library hours are reduced, we deny our kids access to the tools of learning and take away an attractive alternative to gangs and drugs. We believe a strong library system helps prevent crime by giving youth a place to go and a place to learn. We don’t have to throw the book at kids who take refuge in books. Last year alone, more than 500,000 youth visited San Francisco’s neighborhood branch libraries.

Help combat crime by giving our kids an alternative. Vote yes on Proposition E to save the libraries.

*Al Triguer, President SF Police Officers Association
*Arlo Smith, District Attorney

Kids visit the San Francisco Library system more than 500,000 times each year. It provides a safe haven for our children — a supervised environment where they can grow and learn in their after-school hours.

If we don’t pass the Library Preservation Charter Amendment, we will lose many of our neighborhood libraries. It’s just that simple. Let’s not take chances with our kids futures. Let’s guarantee that our libraries remain open, they have useful and convenient operating hours, they have books to read and librarians to help our children grow. Vote yes on Proposition E — for our kids and for San Francisco’s future.

*Margaret Brodkin, Coleman Advocates for Children
*Norman Yee, Wu Yee Resource Center
*Midge Wilson, Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
*David Tran, Tenderloin Youth Advocates
*Elizabeth VonKolin, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
*Sebene Scari, TNDC Tenderloin After-School Program
*Orelia Langston, Income Rights Project
*Linnea Klee, Children’s Council of San Francisco

San Francisco’s branch libraries are essential to the future of our children, our seniors and our neighborhoods. The only way to ensure that libraries remain open is to vote yes on PROPOSITION E.

As representatives of the neighborhood library branches, we support the Charter Amendment for one simple reason: it guarantees our Branch Libraries will be open for the next 15 years. It mandates 26 branches — not inaccessible, understaffed “reading centers” but fully functioning libraries in every neighborhood. That means more books, accessible hours and full-time librarians.

The Charter Amendment also enables branch representatives — in every neighborhood — to participate in decisions affecting their neighborhood library, such as what hours would best serve each neighborhood. Vote Yes on Prop E. Save the branches and help ensure a bright future for our children and our neighborhoods.

*Liesel Aron, Anza Branch
*Larry Ware, Mimir Pavis, Bayview Branch
*Ellen Egburt, Lisa Kaborych, Bernal Heights Branch
*Jade Snow Wong, Chinatown Branch
*Joe Rosenthal, David Axel, Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk Memorial Branch
*Joe Sugg, Excelsior Branch
*Maggie McCall, Ruth Brush, Marina Branch
*Ann Anderson, Merced Branch
*Mario Chang, Hilda Bernstein, Mission Branch
*Miriam Blaustein, Andrew Grimstad, Noe Valley Branch
*Sue Cauthen, Nan McGuire, North Beach Branch
*Margaret Coughlin, Ortega Branch
*Rachel Ellis, Park Branch
*Carol Adee, Karen Boveland, Parkside Branch
*Daniel Harper, Portola Branch
*Richard Millet, Potrero Branch
*Marcia Popper, Presidio Branch
*Linda Ackerman, Richmond Branch
*Barbara Berman, Diane Budd, Sunset Branch
*Kathleen Richards, Vincent Chao, Visitacion Valley Branch
*Bud Wilson, West Portal Branch
*Donald Ray Young, Martha Thibodeaux, Western Addition Branch
*Carol Steiman, Susan Tauber, Glen Park Reading Center*
*Robert Ruiz, Golden Gate Reading Center*
*Ella Driscoll, Ingleside Reading Center*
*Heather Bricklin, Oceanview Reading Center*

*Reading Centers will become libraries again after Proposition E passes!
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As former Library Commissioners, we've witnessed the devastation of San Francisco's library system first-hand. In recent years, libraries have been the big loser in the city's budget wars. Reduced and unaccessible hours, menger book budgets and insufficient staffing now characterize our city's branch libraries.

It is our collective opinion that the only way to save our failing library system is to support the Charter Amendment. By allocating just a tiny percentage of the city's annual budget (1.5%) to library funding, we all can be assured that San Franciscans will enjoy the quality library system we deserve. Branches will remain open, shelves will be stocked with books and librarians will be there to help.

Fund the libraries, keep the branches open and invest in San Francisco's future. Let's not close one of the best tools we have for educating our children. Vote yes on Proposition E, the only option to save San Francisco's libraries.

Former Library Commissioners:
   Ed Bransten
   Raye Richardson
   Dale Carlson
   Jean Kalil
   Edward Callanan
   Steve Coulter
   Marjorie Stern
   Mary Louise Stong
   Virginia Gee
   Ken Romines

The Library for the Blind is a special and unique facility. It fills a vital need in the lives of hundreds of visually impaired San Franciscans and it absolutely must be preserved. Without this valuable resource, we would not have easy access to the Braille and Talking Book reading materials and special facilities that many of us depend on every day.

With Proposition E, the future of the Library facility for the Blind is guaranteed. Please vote yes on Prop E — for all of us who depend on our libraries.

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rudy Mellone
Library for the Blind

As senior citizens, we support the Charter Amendment to save one of this city's most important treasures — our branch libraries. Branch libraries are valuable to all San Franciscans but serve a special need in the lives of many seniors, who use them every day. Convenient and well-located, our branches are community centers as well as safe havens for learning.

Passage of Proposition E will keep our neighborhood libraries open without raising taxes. That is essential to those of us on fixed incomes. Proposition E will guarantee that our libraries will have the newspapers and magazines we cannot afford to buy, as well as the books we all love.

Our library system cannot survive further cutbacks. Save our branch libraries — Vote Yes on Prop E!

Thelma Faltus
Barbara Elias-Baker, Senior Action Network
Joe Lacey, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee
Faye Lacey, Senior Action Network
Rod Rodrigues
Landis Whistler, The Neighborhoods Together
Tatiana Lorbert
Gerda Fiske
Jeremiah Sullivan
Robert Pender, Park Merced Resident's Organization
Jack Coll, Retired Librarian

The last three mayors have threatened to close neighborhood libraries and cut the library budget for nearly a decade.
Proposition E will keep 26 neighborhood libraries open and adequately fund the entire system.
Vote Yes on E.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As supervisor and former president of the San Francisco Unified School Board, I recognize the necessity of San Francisco's branch libraries for neighborhoods and our youth.

Branch libraries must remain as an alternative to the street for children. If the branches close where will they go?

As a legislator, I am supporting the charter amendment because I know we will lose libraries if Proposition E fails.

Proposition E is direct democracy and sets a priority for our city.

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!**

**Supervisor Bill Maher**

Nothing is more important to the education of our children, and the quality of life in our city, than our public library system.

Unfortunately, the mayor has imposed budget cuts that will result in most neighborhood branch libraries being closed and our beautiful new main library never being fully stocked and staffed.

I wish Proposition E wasn't necessary. But it is.

Proposition E will save our libraries — without tax increases.

Please join me in voting **YES on E.**

**Carole Migden**

Supervisor

We are two branch librarians writing to express our personal viewpoint on Proposition E.

San Franciscans have become pretty cynical about city government. We're promised the moon and we get Peoria. Can't they do anything right?

But a city can run a public library. Really well. For about what it would cost each resident to buy two hardback books per year, you have access to billions of words on every conceivable topic.

If this proposal passes, San Francisco will have a great library system. World class, just like its home. Branches open when you expect them to be open. Full of new books for you and your children to read. Compact discs and cassette tapes to listen to. Videos to watch. With friendly, professional staff to help you find it all. Free of charge to any resident.

Please vote yes on Proposition E to give us the resources we need to serve you well.

**Laura Lent**

**Blaine Waterman**

---

Save our Neighborhoods
Save our Children's Futures
Save our Branch Libraries
**VOTE YES ON E**

Bernal Library Committee
Excelsior Library Committee
Merced Library Committee

---

Guaranteed full-service Branch Libraries, no closures, reasonable open hours, upgrading of "Reading Centers", and Books, Books, Books: that's what our 26 Branch Library Support Groups say you want, and that's what this amendment will provide — for 15 years.

Library TNT (The Neighborhoods Together)

---

As public school administrators we are very concerned about the future of our neighborhood libraries. Many of us in the public school system have relied heavily on the public libraries in recent years since our school library budgets have been drastically reduced.

Proposition E will guarantee 26 open branch libraries with current book budgets, qualified librarians and convenient weekend and evening hours.

These branches are an important tool in educating our youth.

Public school administrators say YES on Proposition E and urge you to also vote **YES on E.**

**United Administrators of San Francisco**

---

San Francisco Tomorrow urges **Vote YES on E.** Libraries are one of the mainstays of civilization. The Neighborhood Branch system serves the elderly, children and the poor. Save them before it is too late.

**San Francisco Tomorrow**

---
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As a former Human Rights Commissioner who spoke out against the Mayor's position on human rights and immigration issues, I understand personally the frustration Library Commissioners, past and present, must feel when trying to balance the needs of the community against the political will of the Mayor.

Proposition E is a positive expression of "direct democracy." Nearly 70,000 San Franciscans from every neighborhood, community and background felt that people, not politics, should prevail on the question of preserving our cherished neighborhood branch library system.

As a candidate this November for the San Francisco Community College Board, I understand the usefulness of libraries as a local extension of the learning process. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition E!

Lawrence Wong
Candidate, San Francisco Community College Board

As former mayors of San Francisco, we understand the need for a fully functioning library system with open, accessible branches, full-time librarians and an adequate book budget. It is essential to maintain the quality of life that San Franciscans deserve.

Proposition E, the Library Charter Amendment is not a tax increase. It is a reallocation of existing city funds that will require tighter fiscal management and better priorities from city leaders.

Branches will be open on the weekends with convenient hours for the people of every neighborhood. The book budget will be restored. Proposition E will also provide enough funding for the new Main Library to be open seven days a week.

San Francisco is a world-class city and libraries are a key component of that greatness. If we're to successfully compete into the 21st century, our libraries are an essential tool.

Restore San Francisco's public libraries and vote YES on Proposition E.

Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former Mayor Joe Alioto

As a former San Francisco Library Commissioner, it is difficult to watch the declining state of our library system. A branch with inadequate books, no librarian and minimal hours is not a true neighborhood library. A Main Library that has its stacks half-filled is not a true Main Library.

Proposition E will stop the deterioration of our library system by allocating money for 26 Branch Libraries and adequate funding for the overall book budget. It will restore funds to keep branches open at least as many hours as they were back in 1985. Proposition E would require less than 1.5% of the City's budget to be spent on libraries.

A YES vote on Proposition E will restore our neighborhood libraries to normal hours of operation. It means that our children will be able to enter the world of imagination, wonder, and learning that libraries offer. It means you will have a better chance to succeed in a future governed by the world of information. That is why I have endorsed the Library Preservation Fund Charter Amendment: because a healthy, thriving public library system is essential for our City's future.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition E!

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

The business community believes that a strong library system is essential for a vibrant, growing city economy.

Nothing is more important than keeping our families and economic base here in the city. A city without libraries is simply not an acceptable place to live. Existing businesses will leave San Francisco, and new businesses will not locate here. Jobs will be lost.

Proposition E will save San Francisco's Libraries without raising taxes. By allocating only 1.5% of existing city revenues to Library funding we will be guaranteed 26 branches, full-time librarians, convenient hours and a decent book budget. Money spent on books and libraries is not an expense but an investment in our city's economic well-being. It is an investment in the next generation of working Americans. They are the backbone of our economic future. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Charles Moore, McGuire Real Estate
Angelo Quaranta, Allegro
Leonila Ramirez, Don Ramons
Theodore Seton
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports neighborhood branch libraries. We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E so that we can keep the city's neighborhood branch libraries open for all San Franciscans to utilize and enjoy.

Democrats have long supported the public library system and we believe that it is an institution to be cherished and protected. Proposition E will do just that. It is a charter amendment that will ensure full staffing and full-time hours, so that children, seniors and working people will find their neighborhood branches accessible.

Even during the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, President Franklin Roosevelt managed to keep libraries open seven days a week. The Democratic Party of the 1990's is convinced that the same community values and commitment exists today.

Please join the Democratic Party in voting YES on Proposition E.

Supervisor Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Assembly Member John Burton
Central Committee Members:
Jeanna Haney
Marie-Plazewski
Rev. Arnold Townsend
Peter Gabel
Vivian Wiley
Alexa Smith
Karen Fitzgerald
Patrick Fitzgerald
Eddie Chin
Lulu Carter
Leslie Katz
Matthew Rothschild
Natalie Berg
Caitlin Curin
Claire Zvanski
Maria Martinez
Mike Bosia
Mary Johnson
Elaine Collins-McBride
Ronald Colthirst

Libraries are supported by every community in San Francisco. All San Franciscans have a stake in their future. Whether it's the Eureka Valley/Harvey Milk branch library in the Castro, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Potrero Hill or the Library for the Blind, Gay and Lesbian San Franciscans, like most residents, want the neighborhood branches to remain open.

Our community contributed significantly to the new Main Library which will have a Gay/Lesbian Historical Center — the first of its kind in the nation. Without adequate funding, however, its doors may never open and the Milk branch library will close.

In order to secure the future of our library system, we must pass Prop E. It will not raise taxes, and the percentage of the budget set aside for libraries (1.5%) is small compared to the price we will all pay for a city deprived of neighborhood libraries.

Gay and Lesbian community leaders say vote YES on Proposition E.

Jim Rivaldo
Al Baum
Chuck Forester
Tanya Neiman
Tom Ammiano
Lawrence Wong
Leslie Katz
Roberto Esteves
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon
Dorrwin Buck Jones
Jim Haas
Bill Walker
Tim Wolfred
Mike Housh
Rick Pacurar
Matthew Rothschild
Jim Hormel
Ray Mulligan
Mark Leno
Kevin McCarthy
Carole Cullum
Ken Foote
Robert Barnes
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As educators, we are committed to providing quality education to all the children and youth of San Francisco. The City's library system has always been a cornerstone of quality education. In the last decade, our schools have suffered severe cutbacks, forcing us to rely heavily on branch libraries as a source of educational materials for our kids.

A "Closed" sign on a library door is a blockade on the path to opportunity and learning. We simply cannot deny our kids the chance to learn and to obtain the skills they will need for a successful future. For the sake of education in San Francisco — for the sake of our children — vote yes on Prop E.

Evan Dobelle, Chancellor, San Francisco Community College
Joan-Marie Shelley, President, United Educators of San Francisco
Dr. Leland Yee, President, SF Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, SF Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, SF Board of Education
Dr. Carlota del Portillo, SF Board of Education
Steve Phillips, SF Board of Education
Jill Wynns, SF Board of Education
Maria Monet, President, SF Community College Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred, SF Community College Board
Bob Burton, SF Community College Board
Mabel Teng, SF Community College Board
Rodel Rodis, SF Community College Board

Good Government Provides Good Libraries!

Good government ensures that taxpayers get the city services they pay for! Good government means clean streets, safe schools and open, well-stocked libraries in all neighborhoods for all citizens. Good government works to find well thought out solutions to tough problems.

Good government does not lay off loyal and skilled employees, then contract out their jobs, paying lower salaries with no benefits! Good government does not mistake volunteers for experienced professionals.

Good Government preserves democratic institutions like neighborhood branch libraries. In fact, good government is impossible without good libraries. We support good government. We support Proposition E!

John Lazarus, President, Friends of the Library
Jane Winslow, Executive Director, Friends of the Library
Ronald Cole, DDS
Ellen Huppert

As elected officials in the city and county of San Francisco, we urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. We believe this is the best chance we have to keep the city’s neighborhood library branches open for our children, seniors and all of us who rely on this essential resource.

We agree that libraries are an essential part of San Francisco. We're not a world-class city without them. They help educate our children and give them a safe place to go after school and on weekends. They offer our senior citizens a place to meet and socialize, as well as engage in lifelong learning. Libraries are a key resource that businesses use when assessing whether to locate here, or stay here.

Unfortunately, today’s budget realities require tough choices. Important programs cannot always receive the funding they need. The political process often leaves losers.

San Francisco's neighborhood branch libraries are too important to risk becoming losers in this process. That is why we support the Charter Amendment and urge you to vote yes on Proposition E. By doing so, you guarantee that the library branches will remain open, they will have accessible hours, their shelves will be well-stocked with books and periodicals, and librarians will be there to help you and your children learn.

Proposition E will not raise taxes. It merely guarantees that a portion of the budget goes to funding the libraries. A small amount — less than 2% — is all that's needed to keep our libraries open and available to us all.

It's a small price to pay for something so important. So join us in voting Yes on Proposition E.

Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Susan Leal
Supervisor Bill Maher
BART Director Michael Bernick
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We who spend our lives working in the community know that neighborhood libraries are more than just buildings with books and desks. They are part of the fabric of San Francisco society — a vital part that we simply cannot afford to watch slip away. PROPOSITION E gives the voters of San Francisco an opportunity to stop the decline of our library system and fund the 26 branch libraries for the next 15 years. That means our libraries no longer will be the victim of political power struggles.

Libraries will no longer be funded by the remaining scraps of the budget process, which would ensure the closure of neighborhood branches. PROP E guarantees that a set of percentage of the city's annual budget will go to the libraries. It lets us decide what's important for San Francisco.

As community leaders and neighborhood activists, we think that PROPOSITION E is the City's last chance to save our libraries. It certainly is a key step to take if we're to accomplish many goals we care about: give kids an alternative to crime and drugs; provide seniors with a quality community experience and ensure an urban climate good enough for all of San Francisco's unique and special neighborhoods.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Gordon Chin, Director, Chinatown Resource Center
Lorraine Lucas, Chair, League of SF Neighborhoods
Mitchell Omerberg, Chair, Affordable Housing Alliance
Enola Maxwell, Director, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
Jane Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Polly Marshall, Rent Board Commissioner
LeeAnn Hanna Prifit, President, Diamond Hghts Community Assn.
Jaen Graf, Mercy Charities
Ruth Passen
Bernie Choden
Peter Mezey
Jean-Louise Thacher
Ann Witter-Gillette
Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
Rene Cazenave
David Spero
Brad Paul
Kelly Cullen
Ruth Asawa
Joe O'Donoghue

Every community in San Francisco has a vested interest in the future of our libraries. The City's 26 branches are a valuable outlet for accessible information. They contain knowledge about the lives and traditions of all people and are invaluable to our children's education and quality of life.

Neighborhood branches are in many ways community centers that provide a safe place for our children, friends and seniors to meet and to learn. Branches are sensitive to the needs of the communities and cultures of this city and we simply cannot afford to lose them. The loss of a neighborhood branch library represents lost opportunity and lost hope.

We are supporting Proposition E because it is the only way to save something that we believe must fully operate if San Francisco is to remain the city we know and love.

San Francisco can't afford to lose its libraries. Vote Yes on Proposition E.

Harold Yee
Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai
Claudine Cheng
Antonio Salazar-Hobson
Gene Coleman
Mauricio Vela
Dr. Arthur Coleman
Renee Dorsey-Coleman
Sabrina Saunders
Leroy Looper
Clifford Lee
Lawrence Wong
William Lanter
Ronald Cotthirst
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Once upon a time, a magnificent city by a bay enjoyed fine libraries. Neighborhood branches were chock full of wonderful new books, staffed by kindly librarians, and open seven glorious days a week. The good citizens of the city approved tax increases to build new libraries and expand old ones, and they generously gave for new furniture and bookshelves.

But the beautiful city was ruled by a coldhearted king who cut library funding. Soon, branches were open just a few hours each week. They didn’t have as many books, and librarians were banished.

“We want to go to the library!” the children cried. “Not today,” replied the unhappy parents. “The library isn’t open in the afternoon anymore.”

The people protested, “This isn’t fair. We want more books. We want neighborhood branches open longer, the way they used to be. We want our children to have a safe place to learn.” The people sent the king petitions with thousands of signatures, pleading for better library service.

“No way,” the king proclaimed. “I’ll close police stations if you vote for better libraries. I’ll punish the poor by closing hospitals and clinics. I’ll stop planting flowers in the park.”

This made the children very sad. “Why is the king so mean?” they asked.

The people were very angry. They defied the tyrannical king and approved more funding for libraries.

The following year, the people dethroned the King.

Yes on E.

Barbara Berman
Writer
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Business leaders share with the community an appreciation of the importance of libraries to the quality of life in our neighborhoods. In fact, the San Francisco business community has contributed many millions of dollars to the Main Campaign and are closely involved in the planning of the new library.

But library funding, like other city services, is the responsibility of our elected officials. Citizens who care deeply about libraries should urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide adequate funding to keep branches open, fully stocked and fully staffed. They can do it — they don’t need a Charter amendment to take action now.

Last November, you — the voters of San Francisco — gave the city a mandate to reform and simplify the Charter. Managing the city through Charter amendments is bad government. Entitlements and set-asides constrain the city’s fiscal flexibility and tie the hands of government so that your elected representatives can no longer be accountable for doing their job of running the city.

The Charter is already too complex and unwieldy.

Vote NO on Proposition E.

G. Rhea Serpan, President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

This further intrusion on the ability of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to govern the city will create yet another special fund and siphon approximately $14,400,000 per year from property tax revenue of the City and County. We all love our libraries, but it is the height of fiscal imprudence to place the General Fund in a straitjacket by inserting management details in the Charter. The library’s annual appropriation is approximately $20,000,000. This would increase that appropriation by 70 percent! It would divert money from such departments as police, fire, health and recreation and parks. Proposition E also includes micro-management details such as operating no less than 26 branch libraries, plus a main library and a library for the blind, and imbeds in the Charter a requirement of one or more public hearings at each branch library and the main library for determining each branch’s operating hours. It makes the Library Commission establish 1986 – 1987 hours and prohibits changing those hours for at least five years. One asks why the E doesn’t simply abolish the Library Commission. In fact, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor could as well be eliminated from any process respecting library operations. One could always also ask why departments other than the library shouldn’t possess a dedicated portion of property tax revenue. Why shouldn’t the Police Department, Fire Department, Health Department, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works also take a percentage of the property tax BEFORE it reaches the General Fund? Therein lies the vice of “quick fixes” which use sacred subjects like the library without thinking of long term financial consequences.

Vote no on Proposition E. It’s not the way to manage a City.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Quentin L. Kopp

SPUR supports libraries. SPUR is San Francisco’s citizens’ organization for good government. Our libraries are one of San Francisco’s important public services. Our libraries have been shortchanged. But in these difficult times, so have all other city public services. Proposition E would guarantee money for libraries — by taking it away from other vital city programs.

The additional money which Proposition E would give to libraries could force cuts in Muni bus lines. Or health centers. Or senior services.

Would you like to vote to cut Muni buses, or health care, or senior services? We elect a Mayor and Supervisors to make those hard decisions. Guaranteeing one program’s money in the City Charter, leaves less money to divide among other important programs.

Our libraries need more money. But guaranteeing it to them in the City Charter is bad government. Library budgets must be set by city legislators and managers, responding from year to year to all of San Francisco’s changing needs. Like the U.S. Constitution, the Charter should be San Francisco’s broad statement of purpose and outline of government, not a catalog of administrative detail. Times change. Needs change. The City Charter is inflexible and hard to change. Proposition E sends us in the wrong direction.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
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Employment after Retirement

PROPOSITION F
Shall retired City employees, who have special skills or knowledge, be allowed to return to work for the City for no more than 120 days or 960 hours each year and continue to receive retirement benefits while working? 

YES ➡
NO ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Charter, most retired City employees may not work for the City again. Some retired City employees may work for the City again, but can not receive retirement benefits while working. Retired teachers may have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District and still receive their retirement benefits.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would allow all retired City employees to work for the City, when their special skills or knowledge are required. These employees could not work for more than 120 days or 960 hours per year. They would continue to receive retirement benefits while working, but these benefits would not be increased by this work. These retired City employees could not replace permanent civil service employees.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired City employees to work for the City without suspending their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "F"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

The proposed amendment would allow the City to hire retired employees with special skills for a limited period of time. If the retired employees are used in lieu of either hiring additional permanent employees or paying overtime to existing employees, in my opinion, there could be savings in an indeterminate, but probably not significant, amount.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 14, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
ABSENT: Conroy and Leal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Employment after Retirement

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We urge a YES vote on Proposition F to help the City reduce its personnel costs.

The City Charter currently prohibits the City from bringing most retired City employees back to work, even if doing so could save money.

Proposition F would allow retired employees to work part-time up to 960 hours per year to perform work that would otherwise be done by employees being paid OVERTIME.

Retired employees can be paid at the lower salary range for City jobs, and there would be no health or retirement costs associated with this work. That means Proposition F would make it possible for retired employees to fill jobs temporarily to save the City money.

Proposition F could also encourage cost savings for the City by providing an incentive to existing employees to retire and work a significantly reduced work schedule.

Some 70% of the City’s $1.6 billion general fund budget is spent on personnel. Reducing the cost of government requires finding creative ways to reduce personnel costs. Proposition F can significantly reduce the cost of salaries, overtime and benefits paid by the City.

We urge you to vote for reform to City government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SAN FRANCISCO ALREADY HAS PART-TIME TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES — PROPOSITION F WILL SAVE THE CITY NOTHING.

Proposition F will cost the taxpayers of San Francisco money. Most retired City civil service employees with all their years of service would earn much higher salaries than regular part-time and temporary civil service employees.

With the City’s high unemployment rate, why doesn’t San Francisco hire more part-time and temporary employees? Why should retired civil service employees, making high salaries, take job opportunities away from individuals in need of work?

Measure F, as proposed, would increase City expenditure, take job opportunities away from people, and allow the City to hire high-priced City employees. Many of the jobs under Measure F would be political patronage positions.

Proposition F is a mere fiction. This measure makes no sense. Measure F, if implemented, would be very expensive and would not provide any new job opportunities.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

San Franciscans Against “Freeloading”
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Man
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican County Committee Man
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican Party Chairman
Ramona Albright
President Twin Peaks Council
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Karen Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee Woman
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

“F” IS FOR “FREE-LOADING”!
Proposition “F” is a corrupt proposal that could have been penned by the late Mayor Eugene Schmitz and Boss Reuf!
The San Francisco Charter quite properly bars employees from collecting both a paycheck and retirement.
Proposition “F” would eliminate this protection for the public treasury and allow retired City employees to go back to work while still collecting their retirement checks.
What a bonanza for the favored friends of the politicians at City Hall. Two checks for one job!
But are you surprised?
This measure was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have raised taxes for small businesses, overseen vast increases in sewer services charges, and proposed hundreds of millions of dollars of new bonds at a time when the City is running an operating deficit of over $100 million.
Say “NO” to double-dipping!
Say “No” to free-loading by friends of the City Hall politicians!
Say “No” to Proposition “F.”

San Franciscans Against “Free-Loading
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F TO REDUCE THE CITY’S PERSONNEL COSTS.
The City Charter’s ancient and arbitrary prohibition against people working after retirement may have served some useful purpose early in the Century, but in 1994 it is not in the best interest of a well-run organization.
To help the City reduce its labor costs, Proposition F would allow Departments to have qualified retired people do work that can be performed at lower cost than using permanent employees. Retired employees could not work full time. The fact is they could only work up to 960 hours a year.
Every employee who returned to work under Proposition F would be required to apply and be interviewed under personnel rules. Department heads would not have the power to choose to return friends to work.
What real difference does it make if a retired person can return to work on a limited basis if this system can save the City a substantial sum of money?
Please vote to modernize the City Charter and give the City a much needed tool to reduce costs.
Please vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Employment after Retirement

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I sponsored Proposition F because it will help reduce city government’s labor costs. Proposition F will allow the City to hire back retired employees for part-time work that would otherwise require expensive overtime to be paid. Proposition F will save money, so that more money is available for the services we really need. Proposition F is the kind of sensible reform we need more of in City Hall. Please join me in voting YES on F.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Proposition F will save San Francisco money. City departments could hire experienced retired employees for overtime work or to fill temporary positions. The pay would be at the bottom of the salary range. This would save money and employ qualified people. Efficiencies like these are needed for tax payers to receive maximum service for minimum cost from city government. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, regarding employment after retirement for retired persons.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County an election to be held therein on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 8.511, 8.559-13, 8.585-13, 8.586-13 and 8.588-13 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 1, 1932, and persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him/her in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his/her pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) Limited employment in positions requiring special skills or knowledge:
(1) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
(2) A retired person may be employed in a position other than a certificated position, requiring special skills or knowledge, for not to exceed 120 working days or 960 hours, whichever is greater, in any one fiscal year and may be paid for that employment. That employment shall not operate to reinstate the person as a member of the retirement system or to terminate or suspend the member's retirement allowance, and no deductions shall be

(Continued on next page)
made from his or her salary as contributions to the retirement system. Furthermore, this employment shall not replace a permanent civil service employee.

8.559-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.559 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.585-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired as a member under Section 8.585 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or the giving of, testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by this section.

8.586-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.586 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.586, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.586 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.586. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.

8.588-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and in Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.588 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him/her to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.588, he/she shall re-enter membership under Section 8.588 and his/her retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon his/her re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contributions of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.588. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his/her annuity at the time of his/her re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his/her accumulated contributions at the time of his/her retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his/her service as it was at the time of his/her retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 55 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his/her monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he/she engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he/she held the position which he/she held at the time of his/her retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he/she held the position from which he/she was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2 relating to requirements for mission driven budgeting.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held on June 7, 1994, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 6.201 and adding Sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2, and to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

6.201 Form of Budget Estimates

The classification of proposed expenditures included in budget estimates shall be uniform for all departments, offices, bureaus, divisions and branches. The estimates shall include or be accompanied by the following information:

(a) An itemized estimate of the total expense of conducting each department, bureau, division, office or board for the ensuing fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;

(b) Statements of the expenditures by items for the last complete fiscal year, together with a separate schedule of the proposed work program;

(c) The reasons for proposed increases or decreases, as compared with the current fiscal year, in any items of the proposed estimate;

(d) A schedule of positions and compensations showing any increases or decreases in the number of positions or rates of pay;

(e) Such other information as the mayor or the chief administrative officer may deem desirable.

Section 6.201 Mission Driven Budget

Beginning in fiscal year 1995 - 1996 and no later than fiscal year 1997 - 98, each departmental budget shall describe in detail each proposed activity of that department and the cost of that activity. In addition, each department shall provide the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with the following details regarding its budget:

a) the overall mission and goals of the department;

b) the specific programs and activities conducted by the department to accomplish its mission and goals;

c) the customer(s) or client(s) served by the department;

d) the service outcome desired by the customer(s) or client(s) of the department’s programs and activities;

e) strategic plans that guide each program or activity;

f) productivity goals that measure progress toward strategic plans;

g) the total cost of carrying out each program or activity;

h) the extent to which the department achieved, exceeded, or failed to meet its missions, goals, productivity objectives, service objectives, strategic plans and spending constraints identified in subsections a through f during the prior year.

It is the intention of the people that this mission driven budget process be phased in over the three year period mentioned in this section with the Mayor identifying for each of the three years approximately one-third of the City departments that shall thenceforth be required to comply with the requirements of this section and sections 6.201-1 and 6.201-2. Departmental budget estimates shall be prepared in such form as the Controller, after consulting with the Mayor, directs in writing.

Section 6.201-1 Departmental Budget Commitments

It shall be the duty of each officer, Board or Commission ultimately responsible for the management of each department to certify to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors his/her or its commitment to perform the programs and activities with specified levels of performance for specified costs as outlined in the budget description and other information required by section 6.201.

Section 6.201-2 Departmental Savings and Revenue Gains

Within thirty days of the Controller’s issuance of the combined annual financial report of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller shall report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors regarding the extent to which each department has succeeded in the prior fiscal year in achieving savings measured by the difference between projected and experienced expenditures and the extent to which each department in the prior fiscal year has recovered additional revenues measured by the difference between projected and experienced revenues. The people of the City and County of San Francisco declare that it shall be City policy to encourage the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, upon receipt of this report, through the supplemental appropriation process to give serious consideration to rewarding those departments that the Controller has certified pursuant to this section exceeded their revenue goals or met or exceeded departmental operational goals expending less than had been projected in the budget.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City's current line-item budget process be replaced with a mission-driven budget process?  

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each year the City must adopt a "line-item" budget. This "line-item" budget must contain an itemized list of all expenditures for each department, and a separate list of each department's programs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment that would eliminate the City's "line-item" budget and replace it with a "mission-driven" budget. Each department would have to spell out its goals and organize its budget according to those goals. For each goal, the department would be required to spell out what it will do to meet that goal, whom it expects to serve and how much it will cost.

The budget would also include an evaluation of the department's performance in the year before.

The "mission-driven" budget would be phased in over three years.

The Controller would report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on each department's success in operating within its budget. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would be encouraged to reward departments that exceeded their goals while spending less.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to change from a "line-item" budget to a "mission-driven" budget.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

In my opinion, should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in and of itself, it should not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 22, 1994 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G IS ON PAGE 82.
PROPOSITION'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

We urge a YES vote on Proposition G to make City government run more efficiently, encourage cost savings and improve services.

The City’s current budget process badly serves taxpayers. It encourages city managers to spend every cent they have budgeted, and in some cases to overspend. The system does nothing to encourage cost savings and good management of programs that assure the public’s needs.

A YES vote on Proposition G will establish a Mission Driven Budget for San Francisco. This new system will require City Departments to describe in an annual report all the services they provide, to determine what the public expects from services, and to report on whether they are meeting those goals.

Proposition G will require City Departments to justify the cost of each service or program they conduct so that the Board of Supervisors can assess whether each expenditure of funds is necessary. Proposition G will mean that when City Departments fail to meet performance goals, they will be held accountable. It creates incentives for managers to save money.

Mission-driven budgeting has been adopted by other forward-looking Cities where it has eliminated duplications in services, improved service levels and reduced costs. It is a cornerstone of the nationwide drive to “reinvent” government.

Proposition G is a powerful tool to help make City government more responsive, effective, and fiscally responsible. We urge you to vote YES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITION’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Proposition G talk about a “Mission Driven Budget” is lifted directly from the book *Reinventing Government*, by writer David Osborne and one-time Visalia city manager Ted Gaebler (see Chapter 4 — “Mission-Driven Government: Transforming Rule-Driven Organizations”).

Osborne and Gaebler have a lot of useful warnings about governmental waste. Their discussions of civil service “deadwood”, seniority problems, and non-working employees should be reproduced on a special “WARNING TO VOTERS” page in the front of this “Voters Handbook”.

Osborne and Gaebler fail to understand why Visalia has only a two-page budget and — for good reason — “rule-driven” San Francisco has a two feet thick budget (see page 123).

The answer is that San Francisco has had MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION PROBLEMS:

Visalia has never had a criminal political boss like Abraham Ruet, a disgracefully removed from office 1901-1906 Mayor Eugene Shnit, or their “Boodle Board” of Supervisors.

The City and County of San Francisco needs to KEEP TIGHT CONTROL ON THE BUDGET.

San Francisco is not Visalia.

VOTE “NO” ON UNWISE PROPOSITION G

Citizens For Budget Sanity
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of San Francisco Republican Party and Former Executive Committee of California Republican Party
Arlo Hale Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee and Past BART Board President
Alexa Smith
San Francisco and California Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Central Committee Member
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Mission-Driven Budgeting

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" IS FOR "GOUGING"!
Proposition "G" is a cynical shell-game by City Hall politicians who are operating the City at a deficit of about $100 million to make us think they are doing something to bring spending under control. What a joke!

The change from a "line item" to "mission driven" budget is certain to become an excuse for more studies and more spending to determine what the appropriate "missions" and "goals" should be.

About five years ago, the BART Board of Directors spent several hundred thousand dollars on "research" and "studies" to "implement" a "mission statement." With the City's vastly greater tax revenues and much more imaginative politicians, how much will the Mayor and Supervisors manage to blow on "mission driven" budgets? Two million? Ten million? Twenty million? Fifty million? After all, the only limit is our pocketbooks!

Don't be GOUGED by Proposition "G".
Vote "NO" on "G"!

Citizens for Budget Sanity
Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART Board President
Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Andrew de la Rosa
Democratic Central Committee Candidate
Max Woods
Past Republican Committeeman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.
Don't allow the opponents of this measure to get away with their trickery.

Proposition G will not require the City to perform studies or spend any money to bring about an improvement in the way the City's budget is written. Many other Cities have switched to mission-driven budgeting, and the information San Francisco needs to make this improvement in the way it does business exists without the need to spend a cent.

The truth is that Proposition G can make a vast improvement in the way the City operates. It will involve the public in setting goals and standards of performance for City Departments. It will make clear the true cost of services so that City managers can decide whether those services are justified.

Most importantly, Proposition G will create a system of accountability for City managers who will be required to report each year on whether their services are performing up to the standards that have been set for them.

The voters have a right to demand a better run City government. The same people are opposing every attempt at reform on this ballot. Don't let them block progress toward a better managed City.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Mission-Driven Budgeting

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The City’s budget is too important to be left to the budgeteers. San Franciscans for Tax Justice supports Proposition G, particularly the requirement that department budgets describe programs and provide measurable goals.

The people of San Francisco have a need for a wide range of public services — health care, public safety, social services, transportation, education, libraries, parks and recreation.

But indecipherable budget documents and secretive budgeting methods hide the fact that Downtown and the corporate elite are not paying their fair share — while working people, residents and neighborhood businesses are paying more and getting less.

We support this charter amendment, but we need more! We need “Neighborhood-Based Budgeting”:

**BREAK IT DOWN:** Detail taxes, spending and services by neighborhood so that people know who is paying their fair share and who isn’t.

**OPEN IT UP:** Require departments to develop mission statements and program goals in public hearings.

**GET IT OUT:** Require the Mayor to submit a preliminary budget no later than March 1 so that people have time to analyze and debate it.

**KEEP IT OUT:** Make public the budget data now available only to the budgeteers, department heads and Downtown lobbyists.

**BRING IT HOME:** Mandate public budget hearings in the neighborhoods.

**MAKE IT PLAIN:** Produce a budget that is readable and understandable.

San Franciscans for Tax Justice:
Peter Donohue, Ph.D., consulting economist
Marc Norton, community activist
Joel Ventresca, budget and policy analyst
Calvin Welch, community activist

I sponsored Proposition G to reform city government’s wasteful budget process.

Modern budgeting procedures will result in better public services for the people of San Francisco — without tax increases.

Reduce the waste in City Hall!
Please join me in voting YES on G.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

No government needs “reinventing” more than San Francisco city government. I co-authored Proposition G as an important first step toward restoring fiscal sense to the City’s budget. Please join me in voting YES on G.

Supervisor Kevin Shelley

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be required to select the site for the Airport BART station that is the most cost-effective, convenient and safest, as defined by the measure, without raising City taxes or diverting City funds from police, fire, public health or library programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to make sure that the most economical, safest and most convenient location is selected for an Airport BART station. Proposition H lists a number of factors that the Airports Commission would have to apply in considering a location for the station.

Proposition H would prohibit the City from using money from police, fire, health or library budgets or raising taxes to build an Airport BART station.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to choose a station location for BART service to the Airport based on economy, safety and convenience.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require that the "most cost-effective, safest and most convenient" BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

According to the ordinance, the City would not be allowed to "divert any City and County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City and County taxes" to fund this project. "Essential City programs" are defined as police, fire, public health, parks or library services. The ordinance assumes that revenues will come from the Airport and other government agency grants. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded.

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "H" Got on the Ballot

On March 3, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Bierman, Hsieh, Kaufman, Maher and Migden.

The Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.
Airport BART Station

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Like most San Franciscans, we want BART to go to the Airport and as quickly as possible. But we also want to make sure that the chosen plan maximizes taxpayer dollars, is convenient, and delivers the most mass transit passengers. Proposition H is our insurance policy.

Construction has begun on extending BART from Daly City to the Airport. BART is evaluating several Airport station options each with very different costs.

Regional and federal funding has already been secured for a station at the Airport for BART, CalTrain, SamTrans and the Airport light rail shuttle.

If San Francisco relocates the BART station someplace else on Airport property, San Francisco would have to find funding or pick up the added cost — between $100 million and $400 million more!

None of these other station alternatives has funding. San Franciscans shouldn’t be asked to write a blank check for BART to the Airport when there is a fully-funded, more convenient station alternative. And we shouldn’t be asked to spend enormous sums if a project doesn’t deliver more passengers.

Proposition H would guide the Airport BART station selection process and guarantee taxpayer money is spent wisely by:

• Requiring San Francisco officials to select the most cost-effective Airport BART station, based on lowest total construction costs and cost per mass transit passenger.
• Prohibiting new San Francisco taxes to pay for an Airport BART station.
• Forbidding diversion of funds from essential city services, such as police, fire, public health or libraries to pay for BART.
Let’s make sure San Francisco gets a fair deal. We urge you to join us in supporting Proposition H.

TELL THE CITY TO USE COMMON SENSE!
VOTE YES ON H.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport lightrail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Airport BART Station

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Once the fancy words and phrases are stripped from Proposition H, its true meaning is unmistakable: it’s written so you’ll be forced to transfer from a BART station 1 1/2 miles from the Airport in order to use public transit to SFO!!!

Proposition H defies logic and common sense. Why would Proposition H’s supporters ask us to end our journey to San Francisco International Airport 1 1/2 miles away, across Highway 101, from the existing and planned terminals of SFO?

Airport planners estimate that SFO’s planned expansion will generate an additional 300 flights per day, as many as 70,000 more vehicles on our roads daily and 51,000,000 passengers by the year 2006! What’s needed is a transit system which induces travelers to leave their cars at home and provides direct service into the Airport terminal area. This peculiar proposal discharges San Franciscans at a remote station distant from the terminal area and compels travelers to transfer — luggage and all!!!!

City and airport officials of our country’s largest cities — Chicago, Atlanta and Washington — provide transit systems which directly serve their city cores. Even now engineering plans under the auspices of the FAA are beginning to link JFK Airports and LaGuardia directly with New York City and its suburbs.

Five naysayers on the Board of Supervisors, submitted this lunacy known as Proposition H contradicting the Board’s duly adopted 1990 resolution which affirmed its “support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”. This cute bunch and other Prop H supporters not only have no transit sense — they have no memory!!!

VOTE NO ON TRANSFERS!!! SAY NO TO A BART STATION ACROSS HIGHWAY 101 — MORE THAN A MILE FROM SFO!!! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Senator Kopp’s argument attacks a fictional BART station 1-1/2 miles away from SFO. It is fictional because Proposition H requires the City to choose the most convenient station “at the Airport” located “on Airport property.”

We need a BART system that delivers the most passengers. Like Washington and other cities, San Francisco deserves regional transit serving all Airline terminals directly. The Kopp measure serves only the International Terminal, transporting 328,000 fewer BART passengers annually than other sites.

Environmental leaders support Prop. H because we need the best site to get passengers and 31,000 Airport employees out of their cars. The other plan does not consider Airport workers, 2/3rds of whom work outside the terminal area; its station leaves most employees miles from their workplaces.

Proposition H requires selection of the BART Airport station that best maximizes BART ridership to SFO while minimizing costs. The competing proposition requires construction in a specific area — regardless of cost, ridership or safety.

Proposition H forbids raising taxes or cutting essential services to pay for an Airport station. San Francisco should spend its money on better city services — like police protection, AIDS care and libraries — not the wrong BART station. We just can’t afford the hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes or bonds proposed by the alternative plan.

Vote YES on H for direct service to all SFO terminals.

Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Doris Ward, Assessor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition H is the only fiscally responsible plan to achieve our
longtime goal extending BART to San Francisco International
Airport.
San Franciscans have paid over a billion dollars in sales taxes to
support BART, although relatively few of us ride the system.
But now some politicians would have us pay even more — up to
$400,000,000 more! — to extend BART to the airport.
We’ve paid our fair share!
Proposition H will get us to the airport conveniently without new
taxes or cuts in other vital services.
Please join me in voting YES on H.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote YES on H. This is a better
plan because it serves our regional transportation needs and is
cheaper. Similar systems in Boston and Chicago work well.

San Francisco Tomorrow

All San Franciscans want BART to go to the airport as quickly
as possible.
Proposition H will ensure that BART construction to the airport will
be done in the most cost-efficient, expeditious, convenient manner.
Proposition H requires San Francisco officials to select the most
cost-effective airport BART station based on the lowest total
construction costs and cost for mass transit passenger.
It would prohibit new San Francisco taxes to pay for an airport
BART station.
It will forbid diversion of funds from other city services such as
police, fire, public health and libraries to pay for the BART
construction.
It is for these reasons that I support Proposition H.

Assemblyman John Burton

Why are some politicians opposed to the Cost Effective Airport
BART Ordinance? Because they intend to WASTE OUR
MONEY! Proposition H would force politicians to select the most
cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site —
without raising our taxes, cutting essential city services, or stealing
from the city’s general fund.
Some politicians want to waste up to $500 million of our money
to build a single BART station that will only serve international
passengers.
We’re sick of politicians saying, “Trust me!” With Proposition
H we don’t have to rely on empty promises; we can ensure that the
BART station really will be the most cost-effective, safest and most
convenient.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and
former California Republican Party Executive Committee
member
Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee

This is the smart BART plan for getting the most people to the
airport at the best cost.
This measure simply requires that the City choose the most cost
effective and efficient system for transporting passengers to the
airport on BART.
That’s a good test for any city spending. It protects us from
overspending scarce financial resources or raiding airport funds
needed for job development.
As Mayor, I fought for public transit against some of these same
politicians who wanted more of our state and local dollars to go
towards highways instead of helping bus and Muni riders. We need
good public transit that includes the airport. We don’t need to raise
taxes to get the job done right.
Proposition H keeps our priorities right and makes government
get the job done right.

Art Agnos
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We all want BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to approve any scheme that’s proposed just because we hope it will work. We need a BART station that we can afford, that’s really feasible, and that really meets our transit needs.

• Prop. H would require the selection of the most cost-effective plan to bring BART to the airport — one that won’t cost taxpayers millions of dollars and won’t jeopardize the future of the airport!
• Prop. H would require the BART station to be convenient for travellers who don’t want to drag heavy luggage around, and which will reduce freeway congestion by connecting the airport’s 31,000 employees to their job sites.
• Prop. H would require the selection of the safest BART plan which doesn’t leave passengers stranded late at night without transit options and doesn’t cause environmental problems.

Proposition H makes good fiscal sense. We urge you to vote YES on The Cost Effective BART to the Airport Ordinance (Proposition H).

San Francisco Assessor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsteh

There’s been a proposal that San Franciscans should be forced to spend an additional $100-$400 million on a BART station, even if we have more pressing civic needs or there are better BART options available. We need BART to the airport, but we can’t afford to raise taxes or raid the City’s general fund to pay for it if there’s a better BART option. Proposition H would prohibit any new city taxes or raids on the city's general fund to pay for a BART station.

In addition to transit needs, San Francisco faces several pressing problems — AIDS, homelessness, juvenile crime, public safety, library services — and we need to protect funds for those community issues from predatory politicians.

Proposition H would stop politicians from wasting public money to build a BART station and ensure a BART station that is the safest, most convenient, and efficient.

Supervisor Susan Bieman
Dr. Dan Kelly, Vice president, Board of Education
Rodel Rodis, Vice president, Community College Board
Robert Barnes, North Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus
California Democratic Party
Lawrence Wong, Former Human Rights Commissioner

Proposition “H” assures the most convenient transit to the airport without draining vitally needed funds from Muni.

The most convenient transit is an integrated rail system serving the whole region, including:
• A joint airport station on the CalTrain line for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail to LA and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the peninsula, and will be 10 – 16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.
• A free airport light rail shuttle that whisks passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

Why wouldn’t a BART extension to the terminal area be the “most cost-effective and convenient”?

• The station would be below the future International Terminal. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.

• The $100 – $400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still take the light rail shuttle from BART to their terminals.

• If additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects 700 fewer daily BART passengers than with a joint terminal.

• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100 – $400 million ($300 – $1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote YES on Prop. H.

John Holtzclaw, President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, Former President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Vote YES on Proposition H!
Proposition H will keep the airport expansion on schedule and add 15,000 jobs to the Bay Area’s economy. Prop. I will delay the airport expansion for years and put 15,000 jobs on hold.

A relocated BART station mandated by law will cost taxpayers an extra 100-400 million dollars, money that is not available and will come out of essential city services.
The Airport Multi-Transit Center site approved by BART is already paid for and will be up and running by 1998.
The current plan provides free light rail shuttles 24 hours a day, making it easy for airport employees riding Caltrain, Samtrans and BART to get to work.
Proposition H helps San Francisco officials select the right site for a good BART station. Prop. H emphasizes that THE BEST STATION IS ONE THAT’S SAFE, CONVENIENT AND AFFORDABLE; we don’t want a station that’s going to result in higher taxes or hurt the local economy by delaying much needed jobs.
Let’s help public officials make the right choice for working people.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local No. 350
Air Transport Employees, District Lodge 141
Jerry Nelson, International Association of Machinists,
Local No. 1781 (representing 15,000 Airport Employees)
George Wong, Asian-American Federation of Union Workers
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a disgustingly wasteful half-measure that refuses to answer San Francisco's transportation concerns. The true intent of Prop. H is obscured by empty sloganeering and appeals, but can be found with a just a little common sense. The proponents of Proposition H seek to destroy the greatest public transportation opportunity in our city's history in the name of special interests and political obfuscation.

SAY NO TO THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS AND NO ON H!
San Francisco needs, and was promised, a BART station within the airport. Such a station would enable travelers and employees the opportunity to ride BART directly into the airport. A station outside the airport, which Proposition H prescribes, would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and a transit user's nightmare!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS SAY NO ON H!
A decision of this magnitude does not deserve half-measures. The funding mechanisms are in place for BART service directly into the airport and such a plan will not raise your taxes or raid our city's General Fund. San Francisco deserves to be included in the illustrious group of American cities — such as Washington, Atlanta, and Chicago — that encourage efficient, direct, public transportation from their city cores into their airports. Don't allow the doomsayers to weave their webs of deception and prevent this advance!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H AND YES ON PROPOSITION I!

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

NO ON PROP. H
If bad public policy was a felony BART across the highway would be Supervisor Hsieh's third strike.

Strike one: Hsieh's solution to Muni funding problems was to eliminate transfers. San Francisco lost money on this misguided proposal and repealed it after six months.

Strike two: Hsieh's early retirement proposition cost San Francisco four million dollars and added a net of 5 new employees according to a study by Budget Analyst Harvey Rose.

Strike three: Taking BART across the highway instead of INTO the airport.

THREE STRIKES YOU'RE OUT!
If bad public policies were felonies, Supervisor Hsieh would not ever be eligible for parole. Vote No on Prop. H.

David C. Spero

Prop H doesn't deserve your support and shouldn't even be on the ballot. Supervisors Hsieh and Maher — the Beavis and Butthead of San Francisco politics — didn't have the courage to oppose Senator Kopp's BART into the Airport initiative ordinance signed by more than 15,000 San Franciscans, so they hired political consultants to draft a competing initiative with provisions that sound good but would kill BART into the Airport.

Prop H is about hatred. It's motivation is not public policy but to get even with Quentin Kopp. You see, Kopp supported Jordan over Hsieh for Mayor and Alioto over Hsieh for President of the Board of Supervisors.

Now we have an alliance of environmentalists who dislike BART, airline carriers who benefit from parking fees, and two-bit politicians who have political axes to grind with Kopp.

What a sick bunch.

If Prop H wins we should name the station a mile and a half off the Airport property for Tom Hsieh so that future generations will never forget the two-bit machinations of a hateful man.

Jack Davis

The pack of jackals which supports Proposition H needs a history lesson. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that endorsed the extension of BART directly into the Airport. Some illustrious members of the current board seem to have forgotten that promise of just 4 years ago. Now they stand in the way of San Francisco's greatest step for public transportation in the city's history.

Why the obstruction? Why the reversal? Proposition H is the ill-conceived offspring of narrow-minded politicians and greedy special interests! Instead of looking out for the best interests of San Francisco, this cabal looks to enlarge its own agenda at public expense.

VOTE NO ON H!

If even the odor of a measure could be sniffed out by just glancing at the names of its supporters, it is Proposition H.

Look carefully. Proposition H supporters are the old guard of the tax-and-spenders, the artists of distortion, and the lapdogs of entrenched special interests.

VOTE NO ON THIS RACKET! NO ON PROPOSITION H!

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a misleading specimen of bufoonery that purports to be an environmentally friendly ordinance. In reality, Proposition H is a grave threat to the delicate ecosystem of the Bay Area. By propounding a BART station west of Highway 101, the supporters of Proposition H are eager to destroy our wetlands and annihilate the home of three endangered species.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!

Officials estimate that SFO expansion will bring 70,000 more vehicles daily to the freeways of San Francisco and the peninsula. With all this extra congestion, commuters need a direct, environmentally safe alternative transportation route into SFO. Proposition H is a wolf in sheep’s clothing; it’s not direct and it will only devastate our irreplaceable natural habitat!

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!!!

Frank Cvetovac
Owner, Waste Resource Technologies

Proposition H is wasteful of your tax dollars.
It only makes sense that BART should go directly to the airport. Prop. H would leave the job incomplete. Prop. H would dump passengers outside the airport, where they will have to transfer to a light rail train to take them the remaining distance to the terminal. This extra step adds inconvenience and great disincentive to use the service.

Proposal H is politically, not practically motivated.
There is already a plan for BART to go directly to the airport. A plan that will not raise your taxes but will get the job done completely. Prop. H will undermine this plan in order to serve the whims of special interests.

Don’t get fooled, taxed, or left short. Vote No on Proposition H.

Brook A. Turner, Treasurer
Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

The San Francisco Residential Builders Association urges you to vote NO on Prop. H. Building BART a mile and a half away from the airport would be like building a driveway a mile and a half away from the house. Prop. H is half baked.

Vote No on Prop H.

Joe O’Donoghue
Residential Builders Association

I strongly support a YES vote on Proposition I for one simple reason: Direct BART access to San Francisco International Airport is in the best economic interest of the city.

As the world’s “Number One Tourist Destination,” and one of the world’s leading service industry cities, we need transportation that serves travelers cost effectively and efficiently. Only Proposition I offers such service to the airport.

Arguments against, and alternatives to, Proposition I are largely political smoke fueled by groups and individuals who can see no further than their self serving special interests.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Jon Kouba
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner

Labor in San Francisco is a traditional supporter of public transportation. Many of our members are working-class people who often rely on the efficiency that public transportation provides. Proposition H doesn’t provide this efficiency. Instead, it delivers BART passengers almost two miles away from the airport and forces them to transfer onto other conveyances.

WHAT A WASTE! LET’S DO THIS RIGHT AND VOTE NO ON THE IDIOCY THAT IS PROPOSITION H!

For years, public officials in the City and County of San Francisco have attempted to stymie this major transportation advance. They’ve spent money on pet projects and reduced public services and conveniences. Now they want us to support a half-measure that doesn’t address our needs. Currently, the airport is home to 250,000 passengers and employees per day. Of the 100,000 vehicle trips to and from the airport daily, more than 60% travel Highway 101. Direct BART service into SFO would reduce congestion created by airport expansion along this already busy corridor.

VOTE NO H AND YES ON I!

Alex Corns
Business Manager and Secretary/Treasurer
Hod Carriers, Union, Local No. 36
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROP. I — BART INTO the Airport.

It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP. H. IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

Prop. I is the answer. PROP. I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. It’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop. I makes sense: COMMON SENSE! It will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan.

Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO —

VOTE YES ON PROP I.

WOMEN WANT SAFETY, CONVENIENCE AND AN INEXPENSIVE WAY TO GET TO SFO!

Prop. H means that BART stops 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, forces passengers (and their luggage) to transfer to another form of public transit before they reach their destination in SFO.

Prop. I means that BART will take passengers directly into the Airport. No muss, no fuss. No darkly lit, cavernous bus terminals — just a state-of-the-art, 21st century BART station inside SFO’s brand new International Terminal.

No need to worry about safety or convenience. A baggage check-in facility will free passengers of heavy luggage.

AS WOMEN WE ARE CONCERNED WITH SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE, WE ENDORSE PROP. I AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO REACH SFO SAFELY. “YES” ON I AND “NO” on H!

Lisa Hallinan
Geraldine M. Johnson
Vivian Hallinan
Marie Acosta-Colón
Blanche L. Streeter
Ina Dearman
Edith Jenkins
Heike Peters
Sharon Roberts
Laura Herding
Lisa Haering
Nelma R. McCready
Jo Daly
Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Patricia Sherick-Gronlund
Josephine Roberts
Karen McManus
J.B. Hirst
Joanne Fay
Janan New
Raquel Pasco

Thomas F. Hayes
Former BART Director
Patrick J. Dowling
Anne Quilter
Charles J. Sullivan
Mary C. Sullivan
Joan Finucane
Dan Dunnigan
Margaret Mylett
William Fitzgerald
Julia Fitzgerald
Thomas McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Patricia Hayes
Mary O’Donnell
V.P. John Maher Irish-American Political Club
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION H

VOTE NO ON PROP H (Hsieh). Prop H is an ill-conceived plan which forces passengers to detrain across the freeway, more than 1 1/2 miles from the Airport!!

PROP H might as well be rewritten to read: Get on the train, get off the train, get on a different train, get off the different train, carry your luggage, drag your luggage, hurry up and wait!!!!

PROP H is unfriendly to the elderly and to the disabled. It forces passengers to use as many as three modes of transportation to get into SFO. For many seniors in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the constant physical obstacles and high cost associated with shuttle buses, buses and cabs serve as an impediment to travel. We have a chance to vote for Proposition I which takes BART directly into SFO. Don’t let down our elderly and disabled by approving Hsieh’s plan for BART 1 1/2 miles from SFO.

VOTE NO ON THE UNFRIENDLY, EXPENSIVE PROP H!!!!

Proposition I reaffirms the historic promise to San Francisco taxpayers of direct BART access into our Airport. That promise, for which we’ve paid over $2,000,000,000 in taxes since 1963, was most recently reiterated in a 1990 Board of Supervisors resolution sponsored by Supervisor Hsieh stating:

“The Board of Supervisors hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport”.

Proposition I’s initiative notice makes clear no local tax is needed or allowed for such station, and that it won’t affect City services or be a charge to our General Fund. Proposition I allows passengers to arrive faster and more conveniently and saves more money, regardless of trip length. Of the world’s 10 largest and best airports, eight enjoy rail transit directly into the airport.

Constructing a BART station within the new International Terminal creates jobs and secures SFO’s future as a world-class gateway by 2000. Passengers can ride Airport light rail to other Airport locations (Proposition I does NOT eliminate that service) and utilize joint nearby BART/CalTrain stations. The alternative, Proposition H, dumps passengers with baggage 1.5 miles west of SFO, and destroys large wetlands and endangered species. Proposition I enables use of Airport surplus for public transit on Airport property. This VOTER initiative compels Airport cooperation which under the Charter even the Mayor and Board of Supervisors couldn’t assure us.

Don’t stop BART 1.5 miles outside the Airport. Be safe: VOTE YES ON I, NO ON H.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Dorice Murphy, Pres. Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Frank J. Murphy
Babette Drefke
Roger Perez
Espanola Jackson
Irma Morawietz
Bruce Murphy
Virginia Woo
Frank LaPaglia
Mae L. Lee
Addie L. Lanier
Peter Weverka
William A. Lanier
Ruth A. Lanier
Hudson Lanier
Emanuela N. Catena
Lawrence Goo
Richard A. Wilson
Evelyn L. Wilson
Robert F. Milne
Margaret Sigel
Rosemary Moore
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION H

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SELECTION OF THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE, SAFEST AND MOST CONVENIENT BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT STATION SITE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. This ordinance shall be known as "The Cost-effective BART to the Airport Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare that:

(a) It is in the best interests of the City and County of San Francisco to use available revenues and taxpayer funds as cost-effectively as possible in order to fund critical government service;

(b) BART and other regional transit agencies have already agreed to pay for extending BART to a multi-transit Airport station connecting BART, Caltrain, SamTrans and a new Airport rapid light rail shuttle;

(c) San Francisco residents and businesses should not pay more taxes for an Airport BART station when property and sales taxes have been paid for decades on the promise that these funds would finance a BART extension to the Airport.

SECTION 3. It shall be the law of the City and County that any BART station constructed at the Airport shall be the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient, and that all necessary actions shall be taken by the City and County and its officers to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient station site be selected for construction. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of the construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall adopt such ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions necessary to ensure that the most cost-effective, safest and most convenient BART station site be selected for construction at the Airport.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most cost-effective BART station at the Airport: the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs per passenger to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to extend rail service from the nearest station off Airport property to one on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest actual construction costs to build the actual Airport station on Airport property; the station that uses the lowest cost per passenger to build the actual Airport station on Airport property, and, the station that entails the lowest cost associated with delaying or interrupting current Airport operations and current or approved Airport expansion projects.

SECTION 5. For purposes of this ordinance, the safest BART station at the Airport shall be the one that is determined to best meet federal standards for Airport safety and for such hazards as fires, terrorist acts and earthquakes.

SECTION 6. For purposes of this ordinance, all of the following factors shall be considered in determining the most convenient BART station at the Airport: the nearest estimated start date for the operation of BART service to the Airport; the shortest average travel time for all airline passengers and Airport employees to airline terminals and employee work areas; the least disruption or delay to current travel to and use of the Airport by airline passengers and Airport employees; the least disruption or delay to new mass transportation services to the Airport for airline passengers and Airport employees; the shortest required walking or wheel-chair distance from transit stops; and, the least disruption or delay to completion of the planned Airport light-rail system and the multi-transit hook-up to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans.

SECTION 7. The Airports Commission shall make the determinations provided for in this ordinance by using available data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, BART, other regional transit agencies, and studies conducted by the Airport. Such determinations by the Airports Commission shall be final and conclusive unless two-thirds of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors vote within thirty (30) days of the Airports Commission's determinations under this ordinance to reject these determinations. If such determinations are rejected, the Airports Commission shall reconsider its decision.

SECTION 8. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Airports Commission, and all City and County officers and agencies with any authority over any aspect of construction or funding of a BART station at the Airport shall neither divert any City or County funds from essential City and County programs nor raise City or County taxes to construct a BART passenger station within the area of the Airport or to extend BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. For purposes of this ordinance, essential City and County programs refer to those involving police, fire, public health or library services.

SECTION 9. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, or its application be held invalid to any circumstances, the remainder of this ordinance and its application to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each part of this ordinance irrespective of the unconstitutionality or invalidity of any part or parts thereof.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF RAPID TRANSIT SERVICE INTO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

An ordinance providing for the extension of transportation services by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to and within San Francisco International Airport, together with provisions for funding thereof, and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. It is hereby declared that the most efficient, effective and economical means of improving rapid transit services to and from the San Francisco International Airport (Airport) is by means of an extension of the rail service provided by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to a passenger station located within the Airport terminal area. Such an extension will best serve the residents of both San Francisco and other Bay Area communities, Airport workers, airline customers, tourists and persons traveling between the Airport, San Francisco and other Bay Area locations served by BART. The people of the city and county find and declare that the extension of such rapid transit services to a point within the Airport terminal area is in the best interest of said city and county and the entire San Francisco Bay Area and that the actual station location within the Airport terminal area shall be one which attracts the most passengers.

Section 2. It shall be and is the law of the city and county that a BART passenger station be constructed within the area of the Airport terminals and that all necessary actions be taken by the city and county to secure extension of BART rail service directly into the Airport terminal area. To implement such law, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and all city officers and agencies, including airport commissioners, shall be given authority to act in any aspect of the extension of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District into the Airport shall adopt such further ordinances and resolutions and take all other actions as necessary to effectuate the direct extension of BART service into the San Francisco International Airport terminal area as a part of BART expansion.

Section 3. The San Francisco airport commission shall take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary to finance the BART extension and station construction referred to herein, which shall first include the utilization of available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and may include the adoption of a passenger facility charge as authorized by Section 1513(e), Title 49 (Appendix) of the United States Code. Any imposition of a federally authorized passenger facility charge shall not exceed a period of five years unless necessary to complete the aforementioned construction and unless extended upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Any adoption of a passenger facility charge may occur only if the airport commission has applied for and secured federal authorization to spend the revenue therefrom for the construction of BART into the terminal area.

Section 5. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.

☐
BART to the Airport

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be required to take all actions necessary to extend BART service into the Airport terminal area, and shall the Airports Commission be required to take all appropriate actions to generate the revenue necessary for this BART extension, which shall first include using any available Airport, regional, state and federal funds, and if necessary, adopting a passenger facility charge, if approved by the federal government?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Airports Commission manages the San Francisco International Airport. The Commission's Master Plan for the Airport includes a free light-rail train system to connect all terminals, maintenance shops, parking lots and ground transportation. The Plan also proposes that the light-rail system extend to a bus and train station planned for a site across Highway 101 from the Airport.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit's (BART) line through San Francisco currently ends in Daly City. BART is working on extending service farther south, which could include a station for the Airport.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is an ordinance that would require City officials and agencies to do everything they can to have a BART station located within the Airport terminal area.

To pay for this project, Proposition I would require the Airports Commission first to use Airport, regional, state and federal funds, if available. The Commission could also adopt, with federal approval, a passenger charge.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want BART service to the airport to go to a station within the Airport terminal area.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

If the proposed ordinance is adopted, it would require the Airports Commission and City officials to take all action necessary to ensure a BART station is built within the Airport Terminal area. While estimates vary, most experts place the cost of extending BART from Colma to a station near the Airport at up to $1 billion, with an additional $100 million to $400 million to put a station in the terminal area depending on which of various alternative locations is selected.

The ordinance requires that funding for this project come first from Airport, regional, state and federal funds. Given limited funding at all levels of government, this project would compete with other Transportation or Airport projects and funding this project may mean that other projects would not be funded. In addition, the ordinance allows for revenues to be generated by a federally authorized passenger facility charge of up to $3 per departure ticket (for a limited period of up to five years unless extended by the Board of Supervisors).

In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that General Fund monies would be requested and made available to assist in the funding of this project.

How "I" Got on the Ballot

On March 11, 1994 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition I to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,694 valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1991.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 22, 1994 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

Notice to Voters: Propositions H and I appear to be of the same general purpose. If both measures are approved by the voters, and there is a conflict between the two measures, the one receiving the greater number of "YES" votes will become law.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF PROPOSITION I IS ON PAGE 98.
BART to the Airport

PROPOINENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It guarantees a BART extension to a passenger station within the Airport Terminal area. Proposition I is an intelligent expression of vision. Proposition I ensures San Franciscans will have what they want — direct BART access into SFO. Prop I is the only sensible, responsible choice to secure San Francisco’s reputation as a great city with great transit — like London, Zurich, Tokyo, and Frankfurt.

The opportunity is golden. The Airport’s $2,400,000,000 expansion offers an unrivaled opportunity to build a BART station within the Airport without disrupting the Airport’s operations. Prop I is a commonsensical plan, painstakingly crafted, which enjoys the support of the mayors of San Francisco and its airport neighbors, five BART Board of Directors members, a San Francisco Airports Commissioner and local elected officials and transit professionals.

Funds to build the station will come from available Airport, state and federal funds. SF’s General Fund will not be used!!! SFO, with a surplus of more than $250,000,000 can easily afford to pay its fair share for direct BART service. Parking revenues at SFO alone are projected to be approximately $35,000,000 this year!!! No wonder they don’t want you out of your car!!! Going directly into the Airport saves approximately $100,000,000 that needn’t be paid for right-of-way outside the Airport.

The convergence of 3 critical factors: the Airport’s expansion, available funding, and the resolve of the people of San Francisco for direct BART service into SFO creates an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s seize the moment.

VOTE YES ON PROP I. It’s the only sound, responsible and consumer-friendly choice. Give future generations the benefit of our vision and determination by providing direct BART service into SFO.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! Bring BART INTO SFO!!!

Quentin Kopp
BART To The Airport Campaign

REBUTTAL TO PROPOINENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

San Franciscans want the most convenient transit to SFO. Proposition “I” is not the answer. With Proposition I, domestic passengers must walk 400 – 1300 feet, or transfer to the shuttle to their airline terminal.

A joint Airport station for BART, electrified Caltrain from downtown, SamTrans, and Airport light rail is the answer. This fully-funded solution brings passengers directly to each terminal by rail.

Proposition “I” does not guarantee BART to SFO. The extra $100,000,000 – $400,000,000 is not available:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission refused state and federal money for this station.
• All “surplus” funds are appropriated for Airport expansion.
• San Francisco’s Charter and federal law forbid using Airport money/airline passenger fees for BART.

San Franciscans have paid $1.4 billion in extra sales taxes because we were promised BART to the Airport. It isn’t right to force us to pay even more when a fully-funded Airport station has already been agreed to, at no extra cost to San Francisco.

Proposition I doesn’t guarantee City monies won’t be used to fund this extension, or essential services cut. This project could compete with other transportation projects — money for replacing old buses and METRO cars might be diverted to BART. This means MUNI fare hikes, breakdowns and delays.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to do the right thing. Let’s not blow it.

Vote NO on “I”

Sierra Club
League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Susan Bierman
Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition "I" forces taxpayers to pay as much as $400 million — for the wrong Airport BART station. The Proposition "I" station could require many passengers to make 2 transfers (Caltrain/BART/shuttle), or walk a quarter-mile to their terminals.

In an era of tight budgets, taxpayers’ money must go for critical services — MUNI, police and fire protection, libraries and health care. Resources cannot be wasted on the wrong BART station.

There is no $100 – $400 million to waste. The federal Airports Improvements Act prohibits use of Airport funds or passenger departure fees for BART. There are no identified federal/state transportation subsidies available.

Who pays for the wrong BART station? Proposition "I" requires San Francisco to sign a BLANK CHECK!

A BETTER SOLUTION: Bay Area transit agencies have already agreed to a fully-funded Airport BART station at no extra cost to San Franciscans. Passengers travel directly to each airline terminal by light-rail in 2 to 5 minutes from this Caltrain/SAMTRANS/BART station. Baggage could be checked at this Airport station.

The proposed Proposition "I" station only serves one terminal. It's the wrong station because it:

- Forces domestic passengers to walk up to 1,300 feet to their terminals;
- Doesn't transport 20,000 employees to their Airport workplaces outside the terminal area;
- Reduces BART/Airport ridership up to 700 passengers by eliminating the light rail connection to domestic airlines and employee workplaces;
- Requires up to 2 transfers and 20-minute waits for some passengers.

Environmental leaders oppose Proposition "I" because the wrong station could hurt regional transportation, decrease ridership and reduce MUNI funding. Vote No on wasteful spending. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Sierra Club
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown Jr.
Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Carole Migden
Supervisor Tom Hsieh

No Rebuttal Was Submitted To Opponent's Argument Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I delivers on a promise voters received almost 30 years ago: BART to the airport. BART in the airport, not across the highway, will reduce vehicle traffic and air pollution. It will provide the ultimate convenience for the business traveler and tourist. Many elected and appointed officials have procrastinated with this issue long enough. Now is the time to do what is right for the future of the region. San Francisco is a world class city and it deserves a world class transportation system. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

__________________________

BART almost into the Airport is like not coming. Go all the way. Yes on I!

Lee Goland
Singer/Songwriter/Activist

__________________________

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I — BART directly into the Airport. It’s an insurance policy for the most effective and economical means of improving rapid transit. Let’s vote for the most bang for the buck!!

As a watchdog group for taxpayer dollars, we fully support BART directly into SFO. Prop I uses available Airport state and federal funds. Prop I eliminates a station in San Bruno, for a savings of approximately $60,000,000 which could be redirected for tunneling directly into SFO. Prop I has other potential savings; less right-of-way needs to be purchased, the Airport’s people mover will not have an additional almost 2 miles of track offsite, and no construction delays, as BART into SFO can dovetail with the Airport’s $2,400,000,000 dollar expansion. BART has committed to fund 100% of the tracks, power, signal and platform!! Never before has such an fortuitous set of circumstances afforded such a grand and golden opportunity for transportation policy in the Bay Area.

CARPE DIEM!!! The time is now to vote for BART directly into the Airport. PROP I will not raise your taxes, and its passage will not raid the SF General Fund!!! Who do you believe??

SFTA, defenders of fiscal responsibility and Senator Kopp a proven, experienced watchdog over your tax dollars or the tax and spend liberals who oppose PROP I?

Vote YES ON PROPOSITION I!!! It’s the only sensible, logical choice.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Cheryl Arenson, Director

We believe maximizing public transit use to the Airport is critical. Without effective public transit, future increased Airport use will put 70,000 more cars onto Bay Area freeways daily. Proposition I would minimize the need to transfer for the greatest number of people by ensuring extension of BART into the terminal. The expanded terminal will remain compact and can be well-served by public transit.

BART now serves a quarter million people daily. Although not perfect, it’s by far the most frequently used regional system we have. We should strive to improve it. A BART terminal station need not impair Caltrain Airport service.

Let’s not repeat the mistake at Oakland Airport, where BART users must transfer to get to the terminal. Instead, let’s model our Airport’s future on the success of Atlanta, Baltimore, London and other airports where public transit takes you into the terminal. Anything else would be a costly disaster.

Richard M. Hills, Attorney
Curt Holzheimer, Architect

__________________________

Direct Access from the airport to San Francisco and vice versa is a necessity for the future of Bay Area Businesses. Provisonal 1/2 measures that go “almost” to and from the Airport are not enough! Proposition I will propel San Francisco’s public transportation into the twenty-first century and will maintain San Francisco’s status as a world class city.

LETS MOVE FORWARD! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Robert P. Varni
Community College District Trustee
Stanley D. Herzeit, Jr.
Businessman
Peter M. Finnegan
Former Community College Trustee
Jeffrey L. Pollack
Restaurateur
Daniel Vien-Chevreux
Businessman
Dylan Sanders
Businessman
Elena L. Gracoman
Businesswoman
George Semivan
Businessman
Kenneth Burger
President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants' Association
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Are there politics involved? You bet there are. Leading the charge against this Proposition I is Supervisor Tom Hsieh. On October 22, 1990, eight of ten supervisors, including Sup. Hsieh, voted FOR a resolution of the Board of Supervisors supporting an in-terminal Airport BART station. That resolution (#872-90) reads in part: "WHEREAS, In May 1971, the consultants to the San Francisco Airport Access Project identified the feasibility and desirability of constructing an extension of BART directly into San Francisco International Airport with a main line station one level below the central parking garage. WHEREAS the combined cost to San Francisco taxpayers in 1975 and 1976 of the planning and construction work for the proposed BART extension was approximately $5 million. WHEREAS, the "BART trace" is graphically depicted in the San Francisco International Airport master plans dated 1979 and 1985... resolves, THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby affirms its support for an extension of BART directly into the airline terminals at San Francisco International Airport."

Now, Supervisor Hsieh opposes Proposition I. Why? Because he is opposed to Mayor Frank Jordan and Senator Quentin Kopp. Come on Tom Hsieh. Pull your head out of the sand and see the light. BART should go into the Airport!

Philip J. Siggins
Myron Healman
Art Groza

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Sometimes we do things because they are just the right things to do. PROP I is one of them. BART should go directly into the Airport terminal area — not 1.2 miles away.

Future generations will thank us for having the vision and courage to do what’s right.

VOTE YES ON PROP I — Let’s do the right thing!!

Robert S. Basker
Wm. G. Daniels
Pauline Rosenbaum

Vote with your head and heart on Proposition I. Vote YES if you want a BART station IN the Airport. Vote NO if you want a BART station located over one mile away from the Airport. But don’t be frightened into voting against Proposition I with lies about cuts in our City services.

As commissioners we know the real facts are: The Airports Commission and the Airport operate technically as a utility, almost apart from the City with completely separate funding sources. The Airport gets NO MONEY from the City’s general fund, or from any other City funds. In addition, the Airport sends no airline monies, and only 15% of concession revenues, to the City’s general fund. The Airport has a 30 year contract with the airlines — that runs well into the next century — that prohibits the Airport from sending any other monies to the City’s general fund. Period!

Vote Yes On Prop. I

Vincent J. Rovetti, Commissioner, Parks and Recreation
Beverly Immendorf, Pres. S.F. Film & Video Arts Commission
Jim Herlihy, President, SF Public Library Commission
Ike Felzer, Commissioner Board of Permit Appeals
Jack Immendorf, Pres. Rec & Park Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I’s opponents are lying by suggesting that BART into the Airport will rob taxpayers of essential services. Fact is — PROP I will cost $260,000,000 more than building a station 1.2 miles west, across Highway 101.

BART has agreed to put $100 million into the project and the Airport (which currently has a $250,000,000 surplus) would have to find the remaining $160 million. Prop I calls on the Airport to use available federal, state and local transit monies to make up the difference.

It is nothing more than blatant lies and scare tactics to say that general fund money, police, fire, libraries, social services, etc. — could be used. Don’t be fooled by their scare tactics!! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!!

Rick Hauptman
President
Noe Valley Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As a general contractor, construction manager, and licensed pilot, I was appointed last year to the Airports Commission, a body responsible for the governance of San Francisco Airport. I strongly believe that a convenient transit to and from the Airport is of the utmost importance.

By 2006 we estimate that 51,000,000 people will pass through San Francisco Airport each year. There are over 33,000 people employed there. It's vital that we build a transit system which serves passengers and workers. As many as 70,000 additional vehicles will be thrust out onto Highway 101 every day as a result of Airport expansion. How do we prevent total gridlock?

A BART STATION WITHIN SFO IS THE ONLY SOLUTION WHICH TRULY ADDRESSES GRIDLOCK! Travelers to SFO must have a convenient transit system. That means no transfers and no diversions.

The time is right. This is our only chance. As part of the Airport's $2.4 billion expansion, a new 2,000,000 square foot International Terminal will be constructed and a BART station must be included. A BART station, which has the support of the Mayor and BART's own planners, can be constructed at the same time with no delays! It will be an integral part of the expansion without extra construction time and without any significant expense. Moreover, no San Francisco general fund money will be used. It takes no money from any social program.

There is no world-class city airport being built today without direct rail transportation.

Let's be just as good as London, Amsterdam, Zurich, Frankfurt and Singapore!

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!!

Michael Strusky, Commissioner
San Francisco Airports Commission

We as candidates for the 8th Senatorial District may not agree on every issue but certainly agree on the merits of Proposition I. Half-measures and blind party politics won't improve rapid transit in the Bay Area. Proposition I will!!!

Whether you're a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Libertarian, Proposition I is the right choice.

VOTE YES ON I!!

Pat Fitzgerald, Democratic Candidate for the State Senate
Tom Spinaza, Republican Candidate for the State Senate
Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Independent Candidate for the State Senate

Proposition I is a delivery on a 25 year old promises of direct BART service into SFO. Since 1969, residents of San Francisco have had a BART extension direct from San Francisco to SFO dangle before them. We have even paid extra sales tax in the amount of $1,500,000,000 since 1969 for a BART extension! But because of naysayers and special interests, it hasn't been delivered yet. In fact, this promise has been broken time and again, yet we keep paying and paying! Now five free-spending Supervisors want to block direct BART service into SFO. Don't let them keep taking your money. Your vote for Proposition I will propel San Francisco public transportation into the 21st century!

Let's move forward! Vote yes on Proposition I!

A structural "trace" already exists for a BART station within the airport and construction will not interfere with any airport operations. In 1990, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution endorsing the extension of BART service directly into the airport. The plans are in place and it's time we make our public officials deliver!

No more delays! Please vote yes on Proposition I and deliver what has been promised to us!

Shirley K. Clut
Sherrie Matza, President, Golda Meir Jewish Amer. Demo Club
Carlos Ruling, Treasurer, Norwegian Club

70% of our constituents repeatedly in polls declared that they want direct BART service into San Francisco International Airport.

We share that belief.

In October 1990, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution affirming its support for an extension of BART directly into the Airport terminals at SFO.

That remains the policy of the City and County of San Francisco. We urge you to ensure execution of that policy by voting for Proposition I.

VOTE YES FOR PROPOSITION I!

Supervisor Angela Alioto
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Annemarie Conroy
Supervisor Terence Hallinan
Supervisor Kevin Shelley
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
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It’s sad that 5 visionless members of the Board of Supervisors don’t want San Francisco to be a world class city where visitors from all over the world can be whisked from SFO directly to their destinations. San Francisco hotels, extraordinary restaurants and cultural attractions will be losers if Proposition I fails.

It’s just as sorrowful that San Francisco may be prevented from constructing transit systems like Zurich, Frankfurt, and London which bring riders directly from the airport to the city core.

US cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Washington (National) and Cleveland provide systems which are visitor-friendly. Why not a TRANSIT-FIRST city like San Francisco? Vote to ensure San Francisco’s reputation a modern urban cultural mecca.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO FIRST AS THE #1 VISITOR DESTINATION IN AMERICA!

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION I!

Harriet Ross
Hans Hansson
Shirlee A. Felzer

As members of the BART Steering Committee we firmly believe that the public deserves the most efficient, economical and convenient transit system possible. Careful and repeated analysis of the plans reveal that Proposition I is the only one that works. By placing a BART station inside the Airport, the need for any transfer conveyances is eliminated, the convenience of the public is served and the eventual gridlock on 101 is avoided.

The alternative proposal, to build a BART terminal 1.5 miles away from the Airport, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Hseih’s Prop. H approach would leave us with a one time savings in construction and a lifetime of lower riderships due to the inconvenience of having to transfer to yet another transit system to eventually reach the Airport.

San Francisco has had its share of boondoggles that purportedly saved money; much maligned Candlestick Park and a train that stops short of Downtown are the results of such shortsighted planning. Voters have the opportunity to do something right.

VOTE FOR PROPOSITION I. Let’s Do it right the first time.

Richard M. Hills
Richard Traverso
Thomas F. Hayes
Marc Libarle
Paul Silvestri
Mary C. O’Shea
Jon Rubin

Proposition I meets the criteria of two critical tests — common sense and good planning.

It is common sense that tourists, business travelers and local citizens would be most efficiently and conveniently served by a BART extension that takes them DIRECTLY TO AND FROM San Francisco International Airport, NOT ACROSS THE FREEWAY from the airport. Proposition I is the only alternative that achieves direct access to the airport. Other alternatives would have travelers taking a train to catch another train to the airport.

In planning, one has two alternatives:

- Plan for the long run and serve present and future generations, or
- Plan for the short run and find yourself back at the drawing board in a short while.

Proposition I will be cost effective in the long run, because it will meet the transportation needs of the future and cost far less over time. Other alternatives are band aid patches that will not work and will result in costly catch up measures in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition I.

Sidney Unobskey
President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Don’t be misled! Proposition I will NOT raise your taxes!

Property owners know Proposition I will modernize San Francisco public transportation and give Bay Area businesses the boost they deserve.

Who wants a BART station that isn’t in the airport and doesn’t meet the needs of today’s business travelers? Let’s do this project right the first time and provide direct BART access for passengers and employees into the Airport!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S BUSINESS AND TRANSIT FUTURE!

Nick Sapunar, Realtor
Paul Barbagelata, Realtor
Anna Barbagelata, Realtor
Pius Lee, Realtor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I makes CENT$S. Vote YES on I.
Opponents claim that Proposition I costs more money, that it will bankrupt City departments, and that a BART station located over one mile from the Airport terminals is the right solution. BALDERDASH!
Senator Quentin Kopp, affectionately known by virtually all San Franciscans as the former “tightwad Supervisor,” is no spendthrift. He’s for Proposition I because it makes sense — and will make CENT$S, too!
Imagine 20 years from now. Imagine the future if Proposition I loses. Bayshore freeway 101 is an 18 hour per day parking lot. The BART station, erroneously sited over one mile from the Airport, sits virtually empty. Few people will change trains one mile from the Airport, then carry their luggage into another train at the Airport Intermodal People Mover Station.
Imagine then the real cost of lost time changing trains, or sitting in traffic on the Bayshore freeway.
Imagine then the added cost of gasoline while parked on the freeway. Imagine then the added costs of more air pollution.
And imagine then the cost of running TWO train systems: BART and the Intermodal Airport People Mover.
Vote YBS on I — BART into the Airport. Proposition I makes sense — and will make CENT$S tomorrow.

Nancy Ho, Vice President of Placer Holdings
Louis N. Haas, Partner, Haas & Najarian
Frederic Weicher, Secretary
Dina Fiegener, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Christine Abbolin, Haas & Najarian — Secretary
Susan Lee, Admin. Asst — Haas & Najarian
Patricia White, Haas & Najarian — Secretary

Transportation needs for the African American community have been overlooked time and again. We need an affordable, fast and direct choice in Public Transit. Proposition I will bring jobs and improved transportation.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I FOR OUR FUTURE!

Hadie Redd
Orelia Langston
Erica M. Henri
Ahimsa Sunchai, M.D.
Naomi Gray
Reverend John H. Lane
Lois J. de Gayette
Joel E. de Gayette
Wilfred Ussery
H. Jess Arnelle
Benjamin James, Jr.
Karen Pierce
President, Bay View District Democratic Club
Drevelyn Minor
Southern Heights Democratic Club
Millie Francois
Brian Francois
Doris R. Thomas

Public policy cannot be based upon narrow political agendas! While I disagree with Senator Kopp on some issues I support BART into the Airport because it’s the right thing for San Franciscans.
I’ve been a member of the Finance Committee for four years and know that general fund money could never be used for BART into the Airport. Those costs will be born by BART, Federal, State and other local transit monies. The opponents of Prop. I are trying to mislead and scare the public. Not a penny of General Fund money can legally be used to pay for BART into the Airport.

DO THE RIGHT THING. VOTE YES ON PROP. I!

Supervisor Terence Hallinan

As Gays and Lesbians we join the rest of the Greater San Francisco Community in support of BART going into the Airport. We don’t always see eye to eye with Senator Kopp but this issue is not about personalities, it’s about public policy. We urge you to VOTE FOR PROP. I!

Allen White, Journalist
Wayne Friday, San Francisco Police Commissioner
Jo Daly, Former San Francisco Police Commissioner
Dennis Collins
Doug Comstock
Secretary, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Voters Project
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Chinatown and Japantown are home to the largest concentration of elderly Asian Americans in San Francisco. Many of these people, who are in the twilight years of their lives, have close family who wish to see them living in China, Japan, the Philippines and other Asian countries. The one thing many Asian American seniors have to look forward to, after spending a lifetime in America, is seeing a great grandchild, a grandchild, a grandchild’s new spouse, a daughter left behind or a long-lost sibling. For many seniors, being able to receive and host their loved-ones with dignity after months and maybe years of waiting is their dying wish. One of the most important duties of the Asian host is to be with the visitors when they arrive and when they depart. Often the greeting and the farewell define the role and memory of the host.

Unfortunately, Asian American seniors have great difficulty getting to and from the San Francisco Airport in their effort to fulfill their family obligations to their family members. Most seniors find airport shuttle services fares are beyond their fixed-income budgets and almost inaccessible due to language and cultural barriers. Extending BART directly to the airport would allow Asian American seniors to commute to the airport inexpensively, conveniently, quickly and without relying on others for assistance. In addition, seniors are already accustomed to using muni and muni metro to do their shopping and commuting within San Francisco. Going to the airport would mean that seniors need only transfer from the familiar Muni system to the BART system. Extending BART to the airport is the best way to serve their needs.

Raquel C. Pasco  
Ernesto A. Pasco  
Josie P. Corpuz  
Laurel E. Ayag  
Noemi N. Sablad

Citizens of San Francisco agree: BART should be extended directly into SFO! All residents would benefit from convenient access to public transportation. Proposition I will enable all San Franciscans to travel directly to and from the Airport. Now is the time for action!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I!

Carlota del Portillo  
Manuel A. Rosales  
Vice Pres Redevelopment Commission  
Margaret Cruz

As your representatives on the BART Board, we have closely studied the BART alignment for years. BART must go directly into San Francisco International Airport. Any other alignment would be transit craziness.

- The Airport’s Master Plan for expansion includes an increase from 31,000,000 passengers in 1991 to a projected 51,300,000 by the year 2006, an increase of 151,000 daily vehicles. Only the most effective rail transit system can save our region from traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to the Airport.
- The first principle of rail transit is that when riders are required to transfer, ridership decreases sharply. BART directly into the Airport enables riders to go into the Airport without changing to another conveyance.
- Speak with transit officials at other major rail systems, and there is strong agreement: a rail transit connection to an airport needs to go directly into the airport to be effective.

Michael Bernick, San Francisco BART Director  
James Fang, San Francisco BART Director  
Wilfred Ussery, San Francisco BART Director

For more than 25 years, BART has been planned, operated, and expanded so as to provide direct BART service into San Francisco Airport. We’ve taxed ourselves repeatedly to enjoy such service. A windfall looms: the expansion of SFO, including a new International Terminal. Combining these projects (a BART station within the new terminal) conserves time and money. Proposition I eliminates the bane of public transit: forcing riders to transfer, a process which has ruined Caltrain ridership for decades and renders futile the use of BART to Oakland Airport. A BART station in the Airport reduces congestion on Highways 101 and 280, facilitates use of SFO’s people-mover and brings employees and passengers to their destination.

This initiative’s petition notice specifically states no local tax is needed or allowed, that financing won’t affect city services or be a charge to the General Fund. Please don’t be deceived by Proposition H, sponsored not by taxpayers but by sly supervisors. Its purpose is confusion; Proposition I’s is progress, jobs, comfort, and no cumber-some transferring. Proposition I is a common-sense business issue.

VOTE YES ON I!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Pacific Rim commerce and tourism have been major sources of economic relief and jobs for the Chinatown area. However, tourists and business travelers from all over the world have complained to shop owners and hotel managers that transportation to and from San Francisco Airport ("SFO") is expensive and inconvenient. They cite the long delays between disembarking and securing ground transportation, the high cost of airport parking, the often stressful freeway commute, and the predatory behavior of some private transit operators as unpleasant and unnecessary distractions that travelers to San Francisco endure frequently.

An effective, regional transit system such as BART fills and important niche in the movement of tourists and business visitors in and out of San Francisco. Inefficient ground transportation particularly jeopardizes the tourism trade upon which Chinatown has depended during the recession.

San Franciscans can ill-afford to allow Chinatown to suffer economic dislocation when the jobs of thousands of the City's Asian Americans depend in large part on the tourism industry.

Extending BART directly into the International Terminal at SFO is the best way to provide Pacific Rim Travelers efficient and convenient access to San Francisco.

Airline companies have historically been insensitive to the needs of people with AIDS and other disabilities. Now they are financing the campaign to drop passengers over a mile away from the airport. How dare they! Don't fly the unfriendly skies.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Joe Caruso
AIDS Health Care Provider
Fr. Gerard F. Lupa
AIDS Health Care Provider
Scott Oswald
AIDS Activist
Richmond Young
HIV Task Force
Mike Yestat
AIDS Activist
Dave Robb
S.F. AIDS Foundation
Les Pappas
AIDS Educator
Kate Stafford
HIV Task Force

Jackson Wong
Glenn Tom
Restauranteur
Ben Hom
Businessman
Mae Woo
SF Film Commissioner
Joe Kwok
Businessman
Jonathan Leong
Businessman
Eric Chung
Businessman
Anton Qiu
Realtor
Samson W. Wong
1993 President, Chinese American Democratic Club

Fiona Ma
CPA
David E. Lee
Community Activist
Douglas Chan
Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Calvin Louie
Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Thomas Ng
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Florence Fang
Businesswoman
Roland Quan
CPA

Proposition I is the public safety choice for concerned San Franciscans. Proposition I provides direct BART service into SFO without transfers!

Proposition H, on the other hand, would deposit BART riders over a mile away from the terminal, west of Highway 101, and force them to wait and transfer to another conveyance to continue on to the airport!

As crime-conscious San Franciscans, we believe Proposition I is the best choice that protects San Franciscans!

VOTE NO ON UNSAFE H!

VOTE YES ON I FOR GREATER PUBLIC SAFETY!

Anthony Ribera
San Francisco Chief of Police
Harriet Salerno
Founder, Justice for Murder Victims
Arlo Smith
San Francisco District Attorney
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The facts are simple — efficient, convenient public transit cuts wasteful private transportation. Prop. I is a great boon for the environment. Avoiding the pollution created by superfluous systems of added people-movers and buses that Prop. H calls for and attracting people out of their cars makes Prop I the inevitable choice for the future of the Bay Area.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Marie Cleasby
Henry M. Ortiz
Nathan Rainer, S.F. Commission on the Environment
Supervisor Kevin Shelley

Perhaps just once every generation are we presented with the opportunity to determine the future’s course wisely. By voting YES on I, we can ensure that rapid transit — BART — goes directly INTO the airport. Prop I is the only way to go!

BART service into the new International Terminal will encourage passengers to take rapid transit. The “almost at the Airport” BART station being propounded by the No on I naysayers will simply mean that fewer people will choose rapid transit, and stay in their cars.

Let’s choose the correct course for the future. Vote YES on Proposition I — BART Into the Airport.

John Lee
Battalion Chief, SF Fire Dept.
John A. Ertola
President, Fire Commission

YES ON I means BART directly into the Airport. It’s the only common sense approach.

Prop I asks a basic question: Should a BART station be built directly into the Airport or on wetlands 1.5 miles away from the Airport?

VOTE YES ON I for a BART station in the Airport. Vote yes on Prop H is you want a BART station built 1.5 miles from the terminals across Highway 101!!!

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist — or an Airport engineer — to understand the difference between locating the BART station in the Airport versus 1.5 miles away. Prop I gets you there!!! Prop H doesn’t!!

VOTE for the logical choice. VOTE YES ON PROP I!!!!

Jan Allen
R.G. Lee, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer (Retired),
S.F. Airport
Art Rosenbaum
Shirley Rosenbaum
Ronald Page Lemmon
Nada L. Lemmon
Honor Bulkley
Jonathan Bulkley

As a member of the committee that negotiated funding for BART to the Airport, I cannot conceive why anyone would support less than BART into the Airport. Proposition I will implement what the BART Board intended when we negotiated BART into the Airport. Vote “YES” on “I”!

Arlo Hale Smith
Former BART President
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BART to the Airport

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP I — BART Into the Airport. It’s the only consumer-friendly BART measure on the ballot. It’s the only plan to bring BART directly into SFO. By approving Proposition I San Franciscans have an opportunity to ensure fast, convenient BART service into SFO.

PROP H IS A WASHOUT!!! Who wants the BART station a mile and a half from the Airport?

PROP I is the answer. PROP I is an intelligent vision for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Prop I’s plan brings BART directly under the Airport’s soon to be constructed International Terminal — the largest passenger terminal facility at SFO. The plan also includes an intermodal station, including connections to CALTRAIN. Prop I is so incredible, it actually will drop off passengers 50 feet from a major airline ticket counter!!!

We cannot pass up this superlative plan. Vote for San Francisco — Vote for BART directly into SFO — VOTE YES ON PROP I.

The proponents of Proposition H and their ill-informed “environmentalist” cohorts try to sell us a proposal which destroys wetlands. True environmentalists know that more than 80% of historic wetlands in San Francisco Bay have already been annihilated. Yet, some environmentalists strangely believe that a station, 1 1/2 miles from the Airport, on 180 acres of wetlands containing three Endangered Species, is the cat’s meow.

Equally frightening is the fact that the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has told BART that NO station could be approved at the site (Prop H) unless BART can prove that no practical alternative site exists.

WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE — AND IT’S INSIDE THE AIRPORT!

WE KNOW BETTER AND SO SHOULD THE RENEGADE ENVIRONMENTALISTS!! A BART station in the Airport does not destroy wetlands.

VOTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT! YES ON I!

Christine Hansson
Keith Consoer, Pres
Presidio Ave. Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors
Margaret Verges, Vice Pres.
Presidio Ave Assoc. of Concerned Neighbors

Barbara R. Meskunas
Pres., Planning Assn. For Divisadero Street

George S. Bacigalupi, CPA

Dorice Murphy
Evelyn L. Wilson
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco Tomorrow urges Vote NO on I. This plan is too expensive. Any BART station at the airport will require a People Mover. This station fails to serve our regional transportation needs.

San Francisco Tomorrow

San Francisco voters face two propositions on the location of the San Francisco Airport BART station.

Environmental leaders and transit advocates urge you to vote YES on Prop. H and NO on Prop. I.

Proposition H requires building the BART station in the “most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location.” Proposition I requires building the BART station in “the airport terminal area”—which is not the most cost-effective, safest, and most convenient location for the following reasons:

• The Proposition H station will be built in an area central to all airport terminals and employment sites, and connects them with a fast and frequent rail shuttle. This plan will take domestic airline passengers to their gates more quickly, with less walking and hassle than Proposition I.

• The Proposition H station costs at least $180 million less and can be completed more quickly.

• The Proposition H plan would connect BART, CalTrain, and the airport’s light rail station in a single airport transit station, improving transit access to the airport. The Proposition I plan would require CalTrain passengers to transfer twice to reach the domestic terminal.

• The Proposition H plan would serve the airport’s 31,000 workers better, reducing highway congestion.

We believe Propositions H and I should not be on the ballot. These questions need more careful debate and analysis than can be done in political campaigns. But, since they are on the ballot, we urge you to vote:

YES on Proposition H.

NO on Proposition I.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair
Commission on San Francisco's Environment
John Holtclaw, Sierra Club

Proposition “I” would make transit less convenient for most transit passengers, reducing its use and increasing traffic congestion.

WITHOUT PROPOSITION I:

• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission funds a joint station for: CalTrain (electrified, extended downtown, on BART schedules), BART (if extended to SFO), future high speed rail, and SamTrans buses. CalTrain will provide the major transit from the Peninsula, and will be 10–16 minutes faster than BART from downtown SF.

• Passengers can check baggage at the joint station.

• A free light rail shuttle will whisk passengers and workers in 2 to 10 minutes to the terminals, maintenance facilities, or a future ferry to Oakland Airport.

HOW PROPOSITION I WOULD CHANGE THIS:

• BART would be extended to below the new International Terminal between the present terminals and US 101. Domestic passengers would walk up to 1,300 feet to their airline terminal, or take the light rail shuttle.

• The $100–$400 million additional cost of BART would preclude the joint CalTrain/BART/high speed rail/shuttle station, so CalTrain, high speed rail and SamTrans passengers would have to transfer to BART outside the airport, pay a fare, wait up to 20 minutes for BART, and most will still use the shuttle to get from BART to their terminals.

• If the additional BART costs scuttle the shuttle, passengers would have to walk, and the 31,000 airport employees would drive, increasing congestion. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates 700 fewer daily BART passengers.

• Or San Francisco may have to pick up the extra costs: $100–$400 million ($300–$1,300 per family), or cut Muni service.

Environmental and transit leaders urge you to Vote NO on Proposition I.

John Holtclaw, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Jeffrey Henne, Former President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is the wrong choice for San Franciscans. It will mean higher costs, more inconvenience, and further delays in SFO transit improvements.

- Higher costs — taxpayers will pay up to $400 million. Don’t be fooled! There is no surplus account to cover these higher costs.
- More inconvenience — airline passengers will be forced to walk up to one-quarter mile to their terminals; many passengers will require two transfers; 20,000 airport employees who work outside the terminals will not be served.
- Further delays — Proposition I guarantees protracted political battles to secure extra funding, either from San Francisco taxpayers or other essential city services.

Is there a better choice? Yes!

San Franciscans already have paid $1.4 billion in sales taxes to build an airport BART station. The proposed CalTrain/SanTrans/BART station is more convenient and has been agreed to by Bay Area transit agencies. And it is fully funded, with no extra cost to taxpayers.

Proposition I is a divisive, bloated proposal. There are no surplus funds available. Be aware — the supporters of Proposition I will return soon, to support extra taxes from San Franciscans, or to shift critical funds from Muni, police, fire, libraries, and health care to pay for their white elephant.

Vote against higher costs, inconvenience, and political gridlock. Vote no on Proposition I.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, California State Assembly

We know a better idea when it comes along.

BART service into the SFO terminals once seemed like a good idea, but in reality, it will be inconvenient, costly, and will discourage public transit use to the Airport. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Under Proposition I, BART would only go to the International Terminal. But how many people going to Europe or Asia will take BART to the airport? If you are one of the vast majority of airline passengers going to L.A., New York or another U.S. destination, you could be forced to drag your luggage more than 1,300 feet to your terminal.

By contrast, a multi-transit station linking the airport to BART, SamTrans and CalTrain is already fully funded and approved, with free light rail shuttle system — running every 2-3 minutes — that will check your baggage and deliver you directly to your departure terminal. We think that’s much more convenient.

What’s more, Proposition I doesn’t offer the safest transit option. Airport travelers arriving on CalTrain or SamTrans after BART stops service could find themselves stranded late at night without transit options. Even when BART is running, they could be forced to wait an additional 20 minutes for BART.

Most of all, we consider it irresponsible to spend money we don’t have on this inconvenient Proposition I station. If there’s a magic pot of $300 million out there, we’d rather see it spent on important city services, not the wrong BART station.

Proposition I is lunacy:
- It costs more, but is less convenient.
- It costs more, but won’t get people out of their cars.
- And there’s no planned way to pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

National Women’s Political Caucus
Donna Provenzano, President
Anna Shinko, Political Action Chair
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco could be forced to reduce essential city services if Proposition I is approved. Proposition I would require the city to support a $300 – $500 million BART station at the airport, even though we can’t afford it and no matter what our other civic priorities may be.

- **If we need more police or firefighters — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says that San Francisco must take “all necessary actions” to build a $300 – $500 million station, even if we have to steal from the general fund and cut essential services to do it!
- **If we want cleaner, safer streets — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to put our money into a multi-million transit station, even if it isn’t financially feasible!
- **If we want a BART station that will serve the most people — Prop. I says, TOO BAD!!** Proposition I says we have to pay for a station that isn’t as safe, convenient or accessible as the multi-transit BART station and light rail system already approved and funded for the airport.

Vote NO on Proposition I to ensure that our libraries, bus routes, and essential services like police and fire aren’t cut back.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Matthew Rothschild, Chair
Democratic County Central Committee
Carole Migden, Chair
Lulu Carter
Eddie Chin
Caitlin Curtin
Jeanna Haney
Leslie Katz
Maria Martinez
Elaine Collins McBride
Claire Zvanski
Jim Rivaldo
Norman Rolfe

PROPOSITION I IS A BLANK CHECK THAT WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SIGN. The proponents of this measure want you to approve spending $300 – $500 million — but they haven’t figured out who’s going to pay for Prop. I. Sure, they’ve mentioned several “potential” sources of funding, but it’s ILLEGAL to use most of that money for BART. Federal law prohibits use of airport funds or passenger fees for facilities that aren’t owned by the airport, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already said that additional funds for an expensive station directly into the airport would have to be paid by San Francisco.

That means that SAN FRANCISCANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG. The approval of this measure could force San Francisco to divert public funds from public libraries, health care and law enforcement or to impose new taxes to pay for this expensive scheme.

Proposition I means expensive, wasteful and inefficient BART service. State and federal funds have already been approved for a multi-transit station linking the airport with BART, MUNI and CalTrain. While it won’t cost San Franciscans another dime to build this multi-transit station, the Prop. I station could cost San Francisco half a billion dollars. **Prop. I isn’t the best choice to get BART to the airport,** and we can’t afford to impose new taxes or to cut back essential city services to pay for this scheme.

In tough economic times, it would be FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE to spend money we don’t have. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman of the San Francisco Republican Party and former California Republican Party Executive Committee member

Max Woods
Former member of the Republican County Central Committee
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Don't be deceived. There are NO PUBLIC FUNDS TO PAY.
FOR PROPOSITION I.

1. Federal law prohibits the use of airport funds or passenger
finance charges for BART.

2. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has already
determined that MTC will not provide federal or state
transit funds for the Prop. I station.

3. There are no other sources of federal or state funds avail-
able to pay for this expensive, wasteful scheme.

The airport has already approved a plan to bring BART, CalTrain
and SanTrans to the airport. This multi-transit station is fully
funded and will serve more than 328,000 additional passengers
each year than the Prop. I station.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Tom Hsieh
San Francisco Member, Metropolitan Transportation
Commission

Willie Brown
Speaker, California State Assembly

Bill Maher
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
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PROPOSITION J
Shall persons be prohibited from loitering or lingering within thirty feet of a cash dispensing machine ("ATM") for more than one minute, while another person is using the ATM?

YES    NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: No existing law specifically regulates what people can do at or near an ATM (automatic teller machine).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it a crime to remain within thirty (30) feet of an ATM for more than one minute, while someone is using that ATM.

However, Proposition J would not prohibit someone from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of an ATM, such as waiting in line to use an ATM, waiting for a bus, or waiting to enter a theater or other business.

Before citing or arresting someone under this ordinance, a police officer must give the person a warning and a chance to comply with this law.

After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors could amend or repeal this ordinance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to specifically regulate what people can do within thirty (30) feet of an ATM.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this ordinance.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

In my opinion, in and of itself this measure should not affect the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot
On March 9, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I urge your YES vote on Proposition J.

This is the third time I have had to ask the voters to act when the Board of Supervisors could not resolve an issue. You approved a law against aggressive panhandling and reformed the City’s multi-million dollar welfare system. Now you can improve public safety around ATM machines.

Over 150 crimes occurred at ATMs in San Francisco last year, more than 50 were armed robberies. That is 150 too many. San Francisco must return its streets to law abiding citizens.

Proposition J will protect people using ATMs by creating a safe zone of 30 feet around ATMs. Only people engaged in legitimate business activity, such as waiting at a bus stop or in a theater line, can remain in this zone when the ATMs are in use. This law won’t make criminals out of law abiding citizens, and it doesn’t prohibit the exercise of First Amendment rights. It will keep San Francisco safer, and panhandlers who see ATMs as fertile territory will be discouraged.

Proposition J strikes a reasonable balance between ensuring your safety at ATMs and respecting the rights of all people to use sidewalks. Without Proposition J, anyone can stand next to you at an ATM, and the police can’t do anything. Proposition J will let the police keep you safe.

The police will be able to keep people out of the safety zone who have no business being there. You won’t have to worry about people hovering over you while you open your purse or wallet, punch in your identification number, and handle cash.

If you want to be safer when using ATMs, if you want the police to be able to protect you and those you care about, then vote YES for Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A careful look at Proposition J shows that while it pretends to increase public safety, it will not.

The Mayor proposed this law to reduce crime. But will a law establishing a 30 foot zone around ATM’s really prevent people intent on robbing or harassing ATM customers from doing so? No, of course not.

Will Proposition J succeed in keeping people from entering the 30 foot zone around ATM’s? A careful look at the language suggests it will not. The Mayor has proposed that people unable to conduct their business elsewhere can enter the 30 foot zone. Police Officers will be required to spend their time deciding whether people are conducting legitimate business, rather than addressing serious crime problems.

What is the point of creating a “safety” zone so large it cannot pretend to keep people away from an ATM. Many people with legitimate business will continue to stand near ATM’s. The Mayor’s law seeks to play on the public’s emotions while providing no real benefits.

What the Mayor really appears to be doing then, is using this excessive law to prevent people from panhandling near ATM’s. The fact is that the sidewalks are public property and the Courts are clear that everyone is entitled to use them.

Let’s not allow Proposition J to suffice for a real response to crime in our City. Let’s ask the Mayor to do better.

Vote No on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.
San Franciscans are entitled to safety and privacy when using ATM machines. The Board of Supervisors should adopt reasonable measures to further those goals. It has considered several different approaches to the difficult issues posed by prohibiting people from standing near ATM’s while also respecting the constitutionally protected right to use our sidewalks. Proposition J disregards those protected rights of free speech and assembly. It does nothing to improve public safety.
Proposition J is not necessary and it is not reasonable. It is not necessary because the City already has laws prohibiting people from harming and robbing others. The City also has a law prohibiting aggressive panhandling which is used by the Police Department to protect the public while using ATM’s.
Proposition J is unreasonable. It says no one can stand within 30 feet of an ATM unless they are using the machine or cannot conduct their business, such as waiting for a bus, elsewhere. 30 feet is an excessive limit. Consider what Proposition J means. It means you may be breaking the law if you wait for a friend outside a store or talk with a friend on a sidewalk.
San Franciscans are concerned about crime. The Board of Supervisors has taken many initiatives to reduce crime and violence in our City.
Proposition J will not make us any safer. It is being advanced by the Mayor to appear to provide increased public safety while doing precious little to make us safer. Enforcing a law to keep people from standing near ATM’s is not a good use of scarce Police resources.
Let us put our energies to use solving the real problems of our City. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is necessary and reasonable. You have a right to feel safe when using an ATM, and Proposition J gives you that right. How many robberies or harassing panhandlings must take place before we take action to protect people?
Current laws only take effect after crime has occurred, and they don’t provide a zone of safety. Proposition J will protect people before they become victims and provide a safe zone.
Thirty feet is reasonable. Some cities have limits of 50 feet or more. The police can’t help assure public safety if the zone is less than 30 feet.
Proposition J will make us safer. Keeping people away from you while you use an ATM will improve safety. Anyone who shouldn’t be in the zone, will be made to move.
I urge you to vote YES on Proposition J.

Frank Jordan
Mayor
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

People, who make legitimate use of ATM's feel threatened and fearful because of person loitering near machines. At night it is extremely scary, everyone has had at least one experience, at night, where someone who has made them fearful. Support public safety.

Richard C. Millet
President, Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

Clifford Waldeck
President, Waldeck's Office Supply

Geroge Michael Patterson
Greater Geary Blvd. Merchants & Property Owner Association, Inc.

Karim Al Salma

-------------

ATM machines continue to be targeted sites for robberies in San Francisco. Prohibiting loitering and/or lingering at or near these machines should decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers an additional crime fighting tool that would not infringe on anyone's basic rights.

Vote Yes on "J"

Glenda C. Powell
President, Inner Mission Neighbors

Connie Ramirez, Webster
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

Alex Romo
Board Member, Inner Mission Neighbors

-------------

Proposition J will give the police the tools to fight the increasing crime that is occurring at ATMs in the City. The buffer zone is needed to protect our citizenry waiting in line from panhandlers, from verbal and physical abuse, and from robbery, especially at night. Proposition J will make our use of ATMs significantly safer.

Manuel A. Rosales
Elected Member, San Francisco County Republican Central Committee

-------------

Proposition J is a matter of safety and privacy. THERE ARE NO LAWS THAT PROHIBIT A PERSON FROM STANDING INCHES AWAY FROM YOU WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR BANKING.

Going to the bank in San Francisco should not have to be like running through a mine field. The fact is that often times it is. The average citizen now has to vote to protect their personal safety and privacy.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Supervisor Bill Maher

-------------

The opposition says we would violate panhandler's civil rights by restricting them from trying to take your money while standing at an ATM machine.

Who's civil rights are being violated?

We need a safe zone to allow us an opportunity to conceal our money before others try to take it away. We need protection, WE NEED OUR RIGHTS PROTECTED!

If you haven't been approached by a panhandler at an ATM yet, then help those who have. We need your yes vote for our protection.

Michael A. Fluke, President
Save Our Streets
Tenants and Merchants Assoc.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

If Mayor Jordan wishes to confront the homeless problem, he should place a more meaningful measure on the ballot. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan keep his campaign promises?

Attach the receipts of over $400 per month, in cash, that the City gets for each homeless from state and federal programs for mandatory drug and alcohol detoxification!!

Under Mayor Jordan, San Francisco continues to pay the homeless the highest money benefits in the Bay Area, and in the country. Why doesn’t Mayor Jordan do something to reform the City’s approach to the homeless, such as creating programs to get jobs for the homeless?

Terence Faulkner
Past San Francisco Republican County Chairman

Arlo Hale Smith
Past BART President

Ilene Hernandez
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member

This is a cynical attempt to distract us from the fact that the mayor has no effective, comprehensive homeless program. Vote NO on J.

Joel Ventresca
Budget and Policy Analyst

Proposition J will not make our neighborhoods any safer, but it is a danger to the civil rights of all San Franciscans. Restricting access to public spaces won’t solve the problems of crime, poverty and homelessness. Tell Mayor Jordan you’re sick of band-aid approaches. Vote NO!

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

I proposed reasonable, responsible legislation at the Board of Supervisors to protect the safety and privacy of people using bank ATM machines.

But the mayor was more interested in exploiting an emotional issue for political gain.

Proposition J isn’t reasonable or responsible. It’s extreme, unenforceable and absurd.

Under Proposition J, you could be fined — or even jailed — for talking with a friend or handing out a leaflet or other innocent actions if an ATM machine is nearby. How will public safety be enhanced by that?

Proposition J will waste vital police resources without making anyone safer.

Please join me in voting NO on J.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Don’t let Mayor Jordan turn San Francisco into a police state! Proposition J is a major attack on the civil liberties of all San Franciscans, with the poor and homeless the prime targets. If we surrender our public spaces, what’s next? Vote NO.

San Francisco Green Party

Vote No on Proposition J!

Proposition J wastes precious police resources.
Laws already exist to protect ATM users.

Proposition J violates the First Amendment.
You would be breaking the law waiting for a friend or soliciting signatures for a petition near an ATM.

Proposition J allows police harassment of the poor, but does nothing to increase our safety.

Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Democratic Club
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J goes too far.
Before you believe the politicians' claims that it "won't make criminals out of law-abiding citizens," read Proposition J and decide for yourself.

This new law would declare broad areas of our public sidewalks essentially "off-limits" for ordinary citizens. New "no lingering" zones would stretch out 30 feet in every direction from every ATM in San Francisco.
The only people authorized to "linger" in these sidewalk zones would be people using the ATMs, or waiting for a bus or in a line. The law specifically states that any other activity that "can be conducted" outside of these zones, must be. So, under Proposition J, it would be a CRIME just to:
- chat with a friend,
- distribute flyers,
- sip coffee,
- hail a cab,
- gather petition signatures, or
- read a newspaper.

Defining the act of "lingering" to be a crime just won't work. People can and should be arrested if they actually do something wrong — if they commit a criminal act. But merely "lingering" or remaining on a public sidewalk or using these public spaces for innocent purposes should never be enough to justify an arrest, a citation or even a police order to "move along." Do we want our police chasing innocent people out of "no lingering" zones or do we want them fighting serious crime?

Proposition J is simply a bad law and bad laws are inevitably enforced unfairly.

Of course, people should not be "in your face" at an ATM. But should innocent people — not bothering you at all — have to give up their right to use the public sidewalk just because they happen to be within 30 feet of an ATM? Of course not.

Vote "NO" on J.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
American Civil Liberties Union

Proposition J has no real chance of preventing violent crime. A perimeter zone will not deter those intent on committing theft or robbery. If deterring crime is really our goal, the solution is for banks, which earn money from our deposits, to provide security areas for people to do their banking. The reality is that Proposition J is aimed at our feelings of frustration and discomfort at the number of homeless people living on our streets, and our inability to deal with their repeated requests for money.

No one likes to be hassled by people persistently begging for money. But Proposition J further hardens us to the plight of those whose suffering we should be seeking to alleviate. It's the wrong direction for us to be taking as a society.

San Francisco Democratic Party
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

(Prohibiting Loitering At or Near Cash Dispensing Machines)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, PART II, CHAPTER 8 (POLICE CODE) BY ADDING SECTION 121 THERE TO PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Municipal Code, Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 121 thereto reading as follows:

SEC. 121. LOITERING AT OR NEAR CASH DISPENSING MACHINES PROHIBITED.

(a) Findings. The People of the City and County of San Francisco find that persons who loiter or linger at or near cash dispensing machines imperil the public’s safety and welfare. Cash dispensing machines have become the site of robberies and assaults. Prohibiting loitering or lingering at or near such machines may decrease the incidence of these crimes by providing law enforcement officers with an additional crime fighting tool that does not infringe on any person’s basic rights.

In addition, the People find that persons making legitimate use of cash dispensing machines have become intimidated and fearful for their safety because of the presence of persons loitering at or near the machines. No state law addresses this type of behavior or protects the public from these problems.

(b) Prohibition. In the City and County of San Francisco, it shall be unlawful for any person to loiter or linger at or near any cash dispensing machine located on the exterior of any building.

(c) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this ordinance, a person loiters or lingers at or near a cash dispensing machine when the person remains within thirty (30) feet of such a machine for a period of over one minute, while another person is conducting lawful business by using the cash dispensing machine.

(2) For the purpose of this ordinance, a cash dispensing machine is any machine at which a person may obtain cash by inserting a coded card. Cash dispensing machines include what are commonly referred to as automatic teller machines.

(d) Application. This ordinance is not intended to prohibit any person from engaging in any lawful business that must be conducted within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine, such as (1) conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (2) waiting in line to conduct a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; (3) accompanying or assisting another person, with that person’s permission, in conducting a transaction at a cash dispensing machine; or (4) activities such as waiting for a bus at a bus stop or waiting in line to enter a theater or other business where the bus stop or line is within thirty (30) feet of a cash dispensing machine. Lawful business does not include any activity that can be conducted more than thirty (30) feet from a cash dispensing machine.

Before any law enforcement officer may cite or arrest a person under this ordinance, the officer must warn the person that his or her conduct is in violation of this ordinance and must give the person an opportunity to comply with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) Penalties.

(1) First Conviction. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction. The complaint charging such violation shall specify whether the violation is a misdemeanor or infraction, which decision shall be that of the District Attorney. If charged as an infraction, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $30 or more than $100, and/or community service, for each violation. If charged as a misdemeanor, upon conviction, the violator shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each violation, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Subsequent Convictions. In any accusatory pleading charging a violation of this section, if the defendant has been previously convicted of a violation of this section, such previous violation and conviction shall be charged in the accusatory pleading. Any person violating any provision of this section a second time within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 or more than $500, and/or community service, for each violation, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Any person violating any provision of this section a third time, and each subsequent time, within a thirty day period shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $500, and/or community service, for each violation, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(f) Severability. If any subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Section be for any reason declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or the effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Section or any part thereof. The People hereby declare that they would have adopted this Section notwithstanding the unconstitutionality, invalidity or ineffectiveness of any one or more of its subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or words.

Section 2. After July 1, 1995, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to amend or repeal this Ordinance if the Board finds that such amendment or repeal is in the best interest of the People of the City and County of San Francisco.
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

June 1, 2, and 3

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
PROPOSITION K

Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments with the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled?

YES  ▶  NO  ▶

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The State Constitution requires that City voters approve the building of certain types of low-rent housing units that receive government financial assistance.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved building up to 3,000 low-rent housing units. Since then, nearly 3,000 such housing units have been built, and current City plans would exceed that number.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units to be built in San Francisco.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow up to 3,000 more low-rent housing units in San Francisco.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this measure.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed measure be approved, in and of itself it will have no impact on the cost of government. If individual projects are authorized and developed, in my opinion, they will most often result in minor decreases in property tax revenue to the City.

How "K" Got on the Ballot

On March 7, 1994 the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by the Mayor. The Charter allows the Mayor to place a declaration of policy on the ballot in this manner.
PROPOSITOR’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is necessary for improving the economic and social conditions of our City. Proposition K does not fund or approve any specific housing development. However, because of regulations established in Article 34 of the California Constitution, voters must approve the idea of City funding and regulating certain new rental units. Without your yes vote, we cannot continue to use state or federal housing funds to build new affordable rental housing. Without your yes vote, we cannot begin the construction of Mission Bay which calls for at least 1000 of the 8000 housing units to be affordable rentals and another 1000 to be affordable homeownership units. In 1976, San Francisco voters authorized the City to see that 3000 units of new affordable rental units be built. Developments that have needed such prior approval include Coleridge Park Senior Homes in Bernal Heights, Steamboat Point Apartments in South Beach, Tenderloin Family Housing in the Tenderloin, and Mendelsohn House in the South of Market.

In order to use state and federal housing funds for new affordable rental developments, in order to continue to provide a mix of housing opportunities, and in order to provide construction employment opportunities, vote yes on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITOR’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

NO, WE DON’T HAVE TO “APPROVE THE IDEA OF CITY FUNDING — WE VOTERS WANT TO APPROVE SPECIFIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.”

Proposition K would deprive the voters of San Francisco the RIGHT to vote on specific housing developments. Recent California Court cases have asserted that voting on public housing funding without a specific location gives local officials the right to choose public funding housing sites without voter approval.

The voters of San Francisco have repeatedly rejected outrageous Balboa Reservoir housing developments in already overcrowded area around San Francisco City College. Proposition K would take away your right as a voter to approve funding for specific public funded housing projects.

Unfortunately, when public officials are permitted to make public housing decisions without voter approval, often the size of a developer’s check to their campaigns influences their decisions. Whitewater is one such example.

The developers in Proposition K are already suggesting Mission Bay as a site for a public-funded housing project. Mission Bay is sand-filled and has been proclaimed more geologically unsafe than the Marina in the event of an earthquake. Mission Bay is an unsafe site for any human habitation.

Let’s not give the developers and special interest groups a blank check! Measure K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public-funded housing project.

Citizens For Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committeewoman
Arlo Hale Smith
Past President BART Board
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Past Chairman San Francisco Republican Party
Ramona Albright
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, if passed, would permit the City to double the number of City-financed low cost housing units from 3,000 to 6,000. Besides doubling your tax burden, this proposal allows the Supervisors total discretion over where the public-funded housing units can be located. Proposition K takes away your constitutional right to vote on each public funded housing project. Why should you double your tax burden and give up your right to approve each public-funded housing project.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Citizens for Orderly Growth
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Terence Faulkner
Former Executive Committee Member of California Republican Party
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will not increase anybody’s tax burden. Proposition K will make the City more attractive to businesses and thereby increase its economic health.

Proposition K will not give the Supervisors or anyone sole responsibility to approve a low-income rental development. Under state and local law, no new rental development can be approved without environmental review, public hearings and a finding by the Planning Commission that the new building meets existing zoning and master plan guidelines.

The affordable housing that we have been assisting over more than a decade has improved our City. Though we have different political and economic positions, we firmly believe that the new affordable rental housing has helped stabilize many neighborhoods.

We believe that we should continue to plan for and assist such new rental housing because this housing provides hope and opportunity for lower income households. Because we provide such hope and opportunity, we are all better.

Under the state constitution, if San Francisco employment and business are to continue, we need to approve Proposition K. If we are to continue in the never ending task of improving the City, we need to approve Proposition K. Don’t be swayed by those few individuals who are against everything. Vote Yes on K.

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor
Sue Bierman
Chair, Supervisor’s Housing and Land Use Committee
Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Ronald E. Bonsemer
President, San Francisco Association of Realtors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Proposition K will allow more affordable housing units to be built — at no additional cost to taxpayers.
Please join me in voting YES on K.

Carole Migden
Supervisor

Vote YES on Proposition K
San Francisco is known throughout the world for its cultural and ethnic diversity. But with some of the most expensive housing in the country, it is not always possible for individuals of limited means to live here.

San Francisco has attempted to accommodate these individuals over the years by securing funds, from various sources, for the construction of low income rental housing. However, the city’s ability to obtain these funds, in many cases, is contingent upon the voters authorizing the development of such housing.

Proposition K is a Declaration of Policy placed on the ballot by the mayor seeking authorization from the voters to apply for funds for the development of 3,000 new low income housing units in the city.

The last time voters authorized 3,000 units of low income rental housing was in 1976. Of these units, 1,662 have been completed, 622 are under construction and 374 units are in the planning stage. The primary impetus for Proposition K is the requirement that 1,000 low income rental housing units be constructed at Mission Bay.

San Francisco will benefit from the construction of new low income rental housing at Mission Bay and elsewhere.

Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

San Francisco Association of Realtors

San Francisco needs to continue to provide housing opportunities for all of its residents. We urge everyone to Vote Yes on K.

Art Agnos
Gerson Baker
Lynne Beeson
Paul Boden
Al Borvice
David Brigode
Public Defender Jeff Brown
Thomas W. Callinan
Rene Cazenave
Gordon Chin
Anni Chung
Kelly Cullen
Caitlan Curtin
Pamela David
Yuttum Digdigan
John Elberling
Marty Fleetwood
Helen H. Hefler
Daniel Hernandez
Sue C. Hestor
Leroy King
Jim Lazarus
Jerry Levine
Rick Mariano
L. Kirk Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Robert E. Oakes
Mauri Schwartz
Victor Seeto
Rita R. Semel
Michael Simmons
San Francisco Green Party
Charles B. Turner, Jr.
Assessor Doris M. Ward
Rufus N. Watkins
Calvin Welch

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Voting NO preserves your right to vote on individual projects. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods has always supported affordable housing when neighborhood concerns are adequately addressed. But this measure gives blanket approval to developers anywhere, anytime, and at any density. It is an end run around hard won state constitutional protections passed by voter initiative.

Giving developers the green light to steam roll over neighborhood concerns does not build more and better affordable housing. It leads to lawsuits and ballot battles that could have been avoided by compromise.

Since 1976, when 3000 units were given blanket approval, a number of neighborhoods have been forced to collect signatures to put proposals on the ballot. In the cases of the Balboa Reservoir and the Farmer's Market, neighbors were willing to compromise but the developers were not. With the 1976 declaration of policy behind them, the developers stood firm resulting in unnecessary confrontation and ultimately lost or altered significantly their projects.

The City spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these projects when that money could have been saved had the City followed the procedure outlined in the State Constitution.

Proposition K is a BLANK CHECK! We don't know when, we don't know where, and we don't know how dense the housing will be.

Proposition K is an attempt to set aside a process designed to hold developers accountable to neighborhood concerns.

The City should let the public participate and the electorate decide.

Vote NO on K!

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION K

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall public or private sponsors, with financial assistance from a state public body, be authorized to develop, construct and/or acquire low-rent housing developments within the City and County of San Francisco to provide not more than 3,000 affordable rental units for living accommodations for persons and families of low income, including the elderly or disabled.
I love animals are my friends.

AT WHAT AGE EXACTLY DID WE FORGET HOW TO TREAT ANIMALS?

Find yourself a best friend. We're open 7 days a week, 12:00 to 5:30.

Visit or call us today.
1200 15th Street, S.F.
(415) 554-6364.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special telephone lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398;
To request an Absentee Ballot application, call 554-4399;
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385;
For election results on Election Night, call 554-4375; or
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls to the right desk. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mailbox.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLCING PLACE CARD: Read this pamphlet, then write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number that matches your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each State and Local Propositions.

This is a PRIMARY ELECTION. Only voters who are registered as members of a political party may vote for candidates for partisan offices such as Governor, Controller, Congress, the Legislature, and County Central Committee. All voters may vote for the nonpartisan officers and State and Local propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
Check ballot for the number of candidates to vote for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCAL PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your Polling Place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side? Your return address:

__________________________

__________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
City Hall -- Room 158
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
**OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS**

City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>Green Party</th>
<th>Precincts Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>8th Congressional District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd State Senate District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13th Assembly District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3001 through 3944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter, if you vote at your Polling Place, please bring this entire back page with you.
The location of your Polling Place is shown on the label below.

**Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.**

If you wish to vote by mail, please cut or tear the application below along the perforated lines.

---

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION** - To vote by mail in the June 7, 1994 Primary Election

**SIGN** this application and return it so that the Registrar of Voters receives it no later than May 31, 1994.

Check one below:

- Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Check below, if it is true for you:

- I have moved since the last time I registered to vote. My NEW address is printed below.
  (Residence address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name, Apartment Number

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Check below all that apply to you. Then sign your name.

- I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 7, 1994. I have not and I will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER. I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- All voters receive the English version. I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish____, Chinese____.

You **MUST SIGN** here to receive a ballot.

Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT

The Date You Signed
Your Day Time Phone Number
Your Evening Phone Number

To contact you if there is a problem with your application: